

PROGRESS OF PAKISTAN

BY

S. HYDER

1947

THE LION PRESS - LAHORE

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY G. A. LATHAM AT THE TYPE PRESS
IN QUEEN'S STREET, LONDON

THE PROMISED LAND

God has promised, to those
Among you who believe
And work righteous deeds, that He
Will, of a surety grant them
In the land, inheritance
(Of Power), as He granted it
To those before them ; that
He will establish in authority
Their religion—the one
Which He has chosen for them ;
And that He will change
(Their state), after the fear
In which they (lived) to one
Of security and peace :
“ They will worship Me (alone)
And not associate aught with Me.”
If any do reject Faith
After this, they are
Rebellious and Wicked.
So establish regular Prayer
And give regular Charity ;
And obey the Apostle
That ye may receive mercy.
Never think thou
That the Unbelievers
Are going to frustrate
(God's plan) on earth :
Their abode is the Fire,—
And it is indeed
An evil refuge !

—Quran

To

THE THREE 'A.s' OF MY LIFE

AFTAB : My Mother

AMNA : My Wife

ABDULLAH : My Son

CONTENTS

I. WHAT IS PAKISTAN	-	-	-	-	1
II. LIGHT OF THE EAST	-	-	-	-	20
III. DIRECT ACTION	-	-	-	-	54
IV. CIVIL WAR OR FREEDOM	-	-	-	-	89
V. FUTURE OF PAKISTAN	-	-	-	-	125

CHAPTER I .

What is Pakistan ?

India, the ancient land, the vast continent, the cradle of cultures, civilisations and nationalities—India had been in darkness enveloped for ages. While nations sprang and countries expanded and empires rose and fell, India remained a field for conquerors and superior races—without a nation of its own. When Islam came to India it gave her new life, or *vita nuova* as Dante would call it. For, while the sword of the Muslim conqueror was subjugating the land (not seldom for personal glory of kings and soldiers) the peaceful plough of Muslim light and learning was illumining the dark land and welding the warring factions into a beautiful unity. An order was being born out of chaos. Slowly in Hindustan, and for the first time in her history, there grew up a solid nation—the very heart of the world of Islam re.

As kingdoms tottered in the East and the West, the great Muslim nation born in India grew into a great force—moral and material—for the whole world

Today the Muslim nation is again rising from its centuries-old stupor to assert itself as the *only* compact body of people in this vast conglomeration of cultures, peoples, sects, communities and races. Far from India being a nation, there is no nation in India except the Muslim nation. The Indian Muscisman who owes his birth to India, owes only one allegiance, and that is to his nation which knows no limitations of time or space. The ultimate authority of every Muslim is the world of Islam or the universal Muslim nation. The Muslim of India has the additional duty of giving a lead to the Muslim world. The declaration of the Indian Muslim "I am not an Indian" is only in conformity with the spirit of Islam which says "I am a Muslim first and an Indian afterwards." As for those who say that religion does not make a nation and who would deny to Muslims the right of separate nationality at all, they are ignorant of the very concept of nationality, for they have never belonged to any nation but only

to a country. The geographical conception of nationality does not apply to Muslims because they are a nation scattered all over the earth, while every other nation is restricted within its own boundaries. Christianity and Buddhism are scattered over the earth too, and they are world religions, but a Christian or a Buddhist professes his faith and owes allegiance to his own country. Islam, unlike Christianity or Buddhism, is not merely a religion, but is an active code of life. For a Muslim, to pay supreme allegiance to his country is to deny the very supremacy of the laws of God. For those who say that Muslims must call themselves Indian first or must quit the land—the land is a common heritage of those who live in it, and for a Muslim the land belongs to God, and wherever a Muslim lives or sets his foot, it is the land that is honoured!

It may be asked: do the Muslims then owe no other loyalty, are they a selfish race? No, the Muslim know how to live in peace and co-operate with those who are living with them and to share the soil and the air with any man living on earth. They too are influenced by the circumstances of history

and geography, and differ widely from region to region. But in all these diversities they retain their basic unity and uphold the principle of one-ness, which in fact is the one-ness of God and the brotherhood of man. For such a people, it would be suicide if they relinquish their essential nationality or make it subordinate to any material consideration. The only way to ask for the co-operation of the Muslims and to seek unity with them is by honouring them as a nation, and then asking them to give their share and play their part in the general up-building of the common land. This is true not only for India, but for China, Africa and all other parts of the globe where Muslims reside. But in India it is of supreme importance—for here the Muslims form the bulk of world's Muslim population, and yet are in a minority in the land. The only solution to this paradox is Pakistan whereby the world's greatest population of Muslims will form an independent state, and the rest of India will be free to build its own nationality and form its own state.

Pakistan, then, means not a territorial division of India in which the Muslim state

may tyrannise over the non-Muslims, or the Muslims outside Pakistan may be subjugated by the Hindus,—but is the only means whereby the great Muslim nation of India may feel safe, and the non-Muslims too may have their due share in the life and government of the country. Pakistan, the bulwark of Indian Muslims, will be the leader of Islam, and on the other hand, will be a great friendly unit in India—and thus will form a link between the world of Islam and the people of Asia. The British and the Congress must realise that the Muslims *are* a nation, they will live as a nation, and they will die as a nation.

“What is Pakistan?” asks the critic of Pakistan in the ancient style of jesting Pilate who enquired “What is Truth?” and then would not stay for an answer. If Pakistan has suffered from lack of definition it is mainly because its opponents did not try to understand it—while its full and comprehensive picture is embossed on the heart of every true Muslim in all its details. It is no longer a mere message, a party slogan or an inspiring poetic thought. True, it used to be so a few years back, but today it is the only key for solving the centuries-old Indian deadlock

and for opening the door to the Muslims' future. As such, it is *the* practical plan for establishing the freedom of all Indians.

"I must have the right to think what I like, to say what I like, to do what I like—provided I don't hurt my neighbour" was the first demand for self-determination put by man. Today the same demand is put collectively by social groups or nationalities. The demand of Indian Muslims is nothing else but the just reiteration of the inherent right of man to be free—only in a collective form. And yet, if it is a just and honest demand it must not trespass over the freedom of others, nor be a hindrance to it.

If the opponents of Pakistan think that it is a scheme to enslave the non-Muslims, or to vivisection India into numerous small units perpetually engaged in civil strife, or that it would mean a permanent foreign domination over a disunited country—they are utterly misguided about the whole idea and have never visualised the concrete shape of a Pakistan-in-function. A state of Pakistan, side by side with a state of Hindustan (with ample safeguards for the minority communities) would mean a strong and united

India in which no nation or community would be able to dominate another. The Muslims only want—and this is what Pakistan is—a complete right of self-determination, and when this is established, to obtain *a distinct national status for every Muslim inhabitant of India.*

How is this to be attained in a country where the population is strangely intermixed, but where the national characteristics remain distinct, is the one problem. The advocates of "united" India would readily grant the Muslims a "national" status—but this nationhood would have no meaning for it would be at another's mercy and for the duration of his goodwill. What if tomorrow, in the Azad Hindustan whose constitution has guaranteed religious, political and social freedom to the Muslims, the major community thinks it fit to throw all pledges to the wind, either in practice or by legally calling a new constituent assembly and revising the constitution by a majority vote? The result is sure to be a civil war which will be waged indefinitely until a territorial separation is agreed upon. Where then would be the unity and freedom of India? Pakistan offers a

peaceful and reasonable solution of this delicate problem.

Pakistan as officially put forward by the Muslim League in its famous Lahore Resolution of 1940, envisages a federation of sovereign Muslim states of North-West and North-East India, comprising the present provinces and territories of the N.-W.F.P., Baluchistan, Sind and the Punjab on one side, and Bengal and Assam on the other. The rest of India would constitute the non-Muslim state—one or more, Hindu or otherwise. The Muslims only want supremacy within their own state, and that too mainly over the Muslim subjects—and yet in such a way as to extend their indirect suzerainty over all the Muslims outside Pakistan. This, no doubt, involves a criss-crossing of extra-territorial rights, with about 40,000,000 of Muslims living outside and about 30,000,000 non-Muslims living inside Pakistan? That is why the Lahore Resolution has left much to be decided and re-adjusted in the light of a settlement. That is why the whole scheme has been purposely left in a semi-hewn condition and has, therefore, been attacked as a phantasy. But the main idea stands clear-

cut, *viz.*, the sovereign status of all Muslims and of all non-Muslims throughout India. And as no wholesale migrations of populations are practicable, the Sikhs and Hindus of East Punjab and the Hindus of West Bengal will have the same status and safeguards as the Muslims in Hindustan—and thus both will counter-balance each other.

The whole scheme will be knit together in an Indian confederation, or in other words, *a confederacy of culturally homogeneous states*, in much the same fashion as the old Mahratha Confederacy or the modern British Commonwealth. Even as the Statute of Westminster has served to cement the bond, so will this confederacy of Indian sovereign states would prove to be more stable than an unnatural federation thrust upon the people. In this confederacy the Muslims will only have a fair-sized state, with fair resources, according to their own population which is one-fourth of the Indian total. And if the Hindus and Sikhs of the present Muslim provinces refuse to be "ruled" by the Muslims, they shall be granted independence—but that would mean a similar independence for all the Muslim regions in the U.P., in Behar and Orissa, in the

C P., in Bundelkhand and Malwa, in Bombay and Madras Presidencies and, of course, in Kashmir and Hyderabad. Whatever be the final draft of the scheme, it only means real independence for every Muslim and incidentally for every Indian

What does then Pakistan mean? It means only the desire of every Muslim scattered over the length and breadth of India to have a free and honourable existence as an integral part of the one Muslim nation. It means freedom and honour, *not* at the expense of other people's freedom and honour but as a complement to it and with mutual adjustment. By Pakistan the Muslims do not aim to dominate the non-Muslims of any part of the country, but neither does Pakistan imply the formation of selfish Muslim states in the North East and the North-West zones which will forsake the rest of Indian Muslims. The Pakistan demand is not basically a territorial demand (as some interested parties like the British Government, the Congress and the Communists have tried to interpret it) It is a *national* demand, and it is well known that Muslim

nationhood has never been restricted by the limitations of geography.

Why then separation?—it may well be asked. If the Muslims are an extra-territorial nation, why should they demand specific territories for their homes and why can't they be content to merge themselves in the other nationalities inhabiting the country? Their reply is that they would love to do so if there was no danger of a cultural, economic and political domination by the majority. Under the peculiar circumstances prevailing in India, where the majority is a permanent majority and where the diverse nationalities are intermixed yet distinct, there can be no possible function of democracy in the modern sense. Hence, if Muslim nationalism is to survive it must have a separate state (of only Muslim majority areas) which may also serve as a bulwark for all the Muslims living outside the state. Likewise, the non-Muslims living in the Muslim state will have the *double protection* of their Muslim neighbours and their distant brethren in Hindustan. This inter-state harmony will not infringe upon the sovereignty of any state but will only solidify it,

for it will really be a confederation not of two territories but of two independent nations, and in this way will be much more natural and stable than any federation of Indian provinces.

The creation of sovereign independent states of Muslim India and Hindu India is not necessarily cutting the country into halves or vivisectioning it into small bits hostile to each other—unless the issue of partition is to be settled not by amicable negotiation but by civil war. But if there is going to be a strong and united India of freedom-loving people, then some workable solution must be found for the functioning of a practical healthy government for the country. This is possible only if the Muslims are granted self-determination *first* and then both Muslims and Hindus voluntarily agree to run coalition governments in their respective territories. Coalition is not only possible after partition, but is the sure means by which partition can be mutually beneficial. But it is absolutely essential that this coalition should not be *thrust* upon any party, in that case it would mean a compulsory domination by one party over another. National coal-

ions will themselves arise when every Indian attains freedom—freedom from foreign domination as well as from mutual tyranny.

The advocates of one-party government the provinces and at the centre little realise that they are sowing the seeds of perpetual discord and dissension by which all the minorities in all the provinces, and the minority nation in the country, will perpetually groan under the rule of the majority. But if India is partitioned into sovereign separate states of Hindus and Muslims (and if possible of others), and if these states agree to give proportionate representation to their minorities—that would give effect to coalition democratic governments throughout India in which the minority representatives will have an independent voice and will not merely subsist on granted "privileges and safeguards." But if no coalition is possible and the partition is not to be agreed to by mutual treaties—the only alternative will be the natural birth of innumerable states of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and other nationalities, *with complete elimination of minorityism*, which in the

modern world conditions will bring neither peace nor freedom to the country.

But Indian unity *can* come, not by a federation or an arbitrarily imposed Central authority, but by a *voluntary union* of two separate and sovereign states of Hindus and Muslims. For this, it is essential that both must be free from foreign influence as well as from mutual tyranny. A free India must be an India of sovereign states *forming themselves* into a confederation with a central organisation to look after common interests. The great difference between a federation and a confederation lies in this, that while the first is a single state which confers autonomous powers on its members and can take them back, a confederation is born when a few sovereign states combine themselves into a voluntary group and yet retain their independence. A federation may be suitable for the United States, but it is impossible in India. India has never seen a federal type of government (not even in the benign British rule) but a free India has always been a land of confederacies, for this is not a country but a vast sub-continent

with diverse cultures and nationalities who can live at peace with each other only if they are free.

A confederation of sovereign Indian states would mean a free and strong India, capable of holding her position in the international field. Once the Muslims feel free in their Pakistan, they must and will join in a common Central organisation to run the administrative machinery of all-India affairs. Even on matters of defence and external affairs they will evolve a common policy. In actual practice this will mean the same federation which the Congress and the British Government pretend to concede, but with the vital difference that it will be a voluntary coalition in which the majority will not have the perpetual right to rule and subjugate the "minority." In such a type of confederation, democracy can work at peace, and freedom can be enjoyed by all. A Central Government may be put up on the basis of parity ; and even if such an alliance fails, the confederal states may carry on as neighbours. But if a federation is forced down the Muslim throats, it will positively

mean civil strife and revolt which will hardly give India her independence. Thus, an award of federation would only be an award for prolonged slavery.

But freedom must come—and must come first. The Congress alleges that Muslims want to have Pakistan as a gift from the British and under British protection. That is why, it is said, the League is demanding a division of India *before* the freedom of India, which in effect means that the British should snatch Pakistan from the jaws of Hindus and serve it on a silver plate to the Muslims in return for a continued British suzerainty in the whole of India. But the fact is the other way round. The Congress which is aspiring for a Ram Raj in India can only do so under the British aegis—or rather under the joint Anglo-American aegis—and thus establish itself in a bloodless revolution over the Muslims and also fortify an inherently weak and impotent India against any possible Russian attack. In this way, the nationalists hope to achieve prosperity at home and peace abroad, without having the need to fight for any of them.

But Muslims, though in a minority, cannot be afraid of a majority or for that matter of any combination of power against them, as long as they stand for a right cause. For them freedom is life itself, and without true freedom a Muslim is a burden on Islam. For them can there be any question of seeking the shelter of any alien power? They are demanding Pakistan as their birth-right for freedom: they are demanding it from the Hindus who claim a sovereignty over them by virtue of numerical majority, as well as from the British who had first usurped Muslim freedom by right of conquest. It is not a question whether "first divide and then quit" or "first quit and then divide" but it is the twin demand of "divide *and* quit"; and if one of these demands is not met, the other remains incomplete.

The Muslim demand is for freedom, freedom for the whole of India, but freedom for Muslims at any cost. And freedom is to be won from whoever sits heavily on it. If the British stand in the way, the British are to be resisted; if the Hindus stand in the way, the Hindus are to be resisted. And, if

both make a common cause against the Muslims, the Muslims will still march for freedom and resist both. *But this is certain that Pakistan is to be a free state, free from Hindu interference and from foreign domination.* Nay, the Muslims are not the silent heroes of a negative policy in which they are depicted as claiming their unearned share in the general spoil, or as standing in the way of India's liberation. Nor is it a fact that they want Pakistan if India is to be set free—otherwise they would be content with the *status quo* and would prefer a British India to a United Free India. While a United India is still a distant impossibility, a British slave India is a stark reality—and the Muslims are prepared to fight it first if necessary. That is why they are always ready to come to a settlement with the Congress, for conceding Pakistan and then jointly driving out the British. But if the Congress does not accept Pakistan, then there is no option for Muslims but to resist the transformation of the present evil of British India into the future evil of Hindu India, as both are the enemies of

freedom. But in any case, a British India—whether a united British India or a divided British India—will never be acceptable to Muslims.

CHAPTER II

Light of the East

Pakistan in essence means Islam. It had its birth in the idea of Pan-Islamism which is as old as Islam itself. But thanks to the various hands, both hostile and friendly, through which it has passed, with the mass of interpretation and counter-interpretation heaped upon it, and by its use as a peculiar political weapon in the current Indian conditions, Pakistan has been disfigured out of its original shape and has aroused the greatest political controversy of modern times. It has been given out, by turns, as an article of faith, a political creed, a solution of India's multifarious ills, a way of peace and freedom, and as a mischievous stunt of strife and serfdom. With the ultimate result that today, when so much force has been spent on the idea, and when a semblance of Pakistan even seems to be within sight

and within reach—the real Pakistan is still as distant as ever, a Pakistan which will be a lighthouse of power and goodness in the modern world, and which will give freedom and peace not only to Indian Muslims but to the whole of India on the one hand and to the larger world of Islam on the other.

When the Muslim League adopted the child as its own in 1940 and thereby gave it a home, a “local habitation and a name,” it had seen many a summer in the freer and healthier air of the desert. More than a hundred years back, in the second decade of the 19th century, two noble Mujahids—Syed Ahmed Brelvi and his disciple, Ismail Shaheed—went from the U. P. on a crusading mission to the Punjab to liberate the oppressed Muslims from the tyranny of Ranjit Singh’s rule and even succeeded for a time in doing so when their holy band of warriors captured parts of the N.-W.F.P. and installed a Muslim Government in Peshawar (1830). They, however, had to lose it soon after (1831), together with their own lives, when the unwitting Pathans, falsely led by the British propaganda machinery into believing these heroic

Mujahids to be religious heretics, turned against them and exposed them to the mercy of the Sikh swords. In this holy mission it was the spirit of Pakistan that was at work. Only it was the other way round—for here the Muslims from the minority areas were going to the rescue of Muslims in Pakistan¹

The revolutionary movement of 1857 was also inspired by the same spirit of Islamic brotherhood and freedom—though it was a grander and India-wide struggle in which all the nationalities and popular forces of India had combined to overthrow the British rule and to restore the Muslims into power. For, the new rule of the foreigner had proved that Muslims had been by far the better rulers and that a Pakistan in the whole of India was still the best guarantee for the freedom and prosperity of all Indians.

A greater and broader Pakistan was conceived—even after the Muslims had been finally crushed and India enslaved in 1857—by the international Muslim figure of Jamal ud-Din Afghani, who for the first time visualised the linking up of the north-western parts of India with the adjoining

Muslim countries and forming a pan-Islamic federation. Syed Jamal-ud-Din was born (Afghanistan 1839) at a time when the huge and ancient edifice of the world of Islam was shaking on its weakened foundations, and was about to fall. The Turkish Empire which had held a more or less factual sway over Muslim countries, and which was still the living though corrupt symbol of the old Caliphate, was regarded as the "Sick Man of Europe". The Russians on the one hand and the British and the French on the other, were advancing the cloven hooves of Western Imperialism and were slowly planting them in Egypt, Persia and Arabia ; the whole desert belt from Lybia to Morocco had been already enslaved ; and India was firmly secured in the imperial stranglehold. The unity of the Islamic world, which had stood the test of centuries, was now breaking asunder under the shattering hammer-blows of the European Imperialists. It was against this advancing tide which threatened to engulf the very citadel of Islam, that a young Mujahid born in backward Afghanistan rose to fight, and built up his dream of a modern Muslim world

state. He carried his message—strengthened with his singular gifts of light and learning—from Afghanistan to India, Egypt, Persia and the very centre of Calipaate, Turkey, right into Europe. But the forces of destruction had advanced too far to be checked. The tottering edifice of Islamic independence and brotherhood *had* to fall. The mission of Jamal-ud-Din remained incomplete—and waited till the destruction was thorough so that new foundations might be laid on the debris of the old. When he died in 1897, he left a legacy for the entire Muslim world—of which he had become the first citizen—to carry on into history and translate into reality.

But it was only Iqbal—that glorious soul who came and re-inspired the almost lost message of the Prophet (Peace and blessings be on him)—who gave back to the degraded Muslims the meaning of faith and freedom which they had forsaken for almost a century, and who therefore is the real father of Pakistan.

The history of Muslim degradation begins from 1857. Never before had the Muslims of

India been at such a low ebb of their power, prestige and character. The Mutiny was their last stroke, the concluding engagement in the losing battle of freedom—the flicker of a dying lamp—and had failed. The Muslims' downfall was complete—politically, economically and morally. They were hunted down like animals, their leaders hanged in public squares, and their patriotism dubbed as vagabondry and black treachery. Their properties, houses and *jagirs* were confiscated and given away as reward to their erstwhile friends now turned into rivals. What was worse—nay, worst—the Muslims themselves began to hang their heads in shame at what they had done. They rued, repented and whined at the feet of the merciless conqueror. There rose among them a particular tribe of apologetic leaders who craved for forgiveness, craved for the mercies and prayed for the glories of British Raj, and called it the greatest boon and blessing for the Indian Mussalmans! Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was the top-most among them. He set new standards of ethics for the nation's politics, its culture and education, and even for its religion. In

his famous commentary on the Quran, he gave new meaning to the term Jihad "The time for Jihad with sword has gone now is the time for Jihad with only the pen," he said, and advised the Muslims to sheath their sword for ever and instead pursue the more appropriate trade of learning the Western knowledge, of imitating the Western culture and of gaining the British favours. A seal had been set on the heart and the minds of the depraved Indian Mussalmans. Once the demoralisation had begun, it grew on until it had penetrated the very roots of the Millat and had permeated the heart and the body of every Muslim of India. Gradually and steadily, the nation of warriors and conquerors was transformed into a nation of slaves, who acquiesced in their slavery and forgot even to think in terms of a free and respectable people. The direct result of this slavish mentality was that the initiative of Indian freedom which for centuries had been the monopoly of Muslims, now passed into Hindu hands. And the British took an active and helping interest in it. They tacitly encouraged the growth of Hindu nationalism, as a

sure weapon against resurrection of Muslim power which they so much dreaded. It was with this motive only that the nucleus was laid of the Indian National Congress under the active leadership and guidance of Englishmen, headed by Mr. Hume. At the same time, however, the British never faltered in *outward* support and encouragement to the loyal Muslim element, with a view (i) to keep the spirit of Muslim revolt stifled, and (ii) to maintain a check on Hindu nationalism by using Muslims as a bargaining counter. Thus, while one set of Englishmen was laying the foundation of the Indian Congress, another set representing the British Tories had captured the fortress of Muslim cultural revival at Aligarh and from there was guiding the entire Muslim polity (almost imperceptibly) into reactionary and negative channels whereby the Muslims were compelled to toe the line of British statesmen and to let the initiative pass into Hindu hands. As a successful result of this double-crossing policy, popularly known as "divide-and-rule"—which was really aimed at Muslims though professedly pro-Muslim—the British succeed-

ed in weaning the Muslims away from the main current of freedom and reduced them to the status of a helpless minority.

It was against this terrible holocaust—when not only the body but even the soul of the nation was dead—that Iqbal rose with his lash of "Self" (*Khudi*) and with his symphony of Divine Love, (*Soz-e-Yaqeen*) so that the Muslims who had lolled and basked in the false sunshine of their serfdom for well-nigh fifty years, and who had sold the Quran either for the vain superstitions of the Mulla or for the worldly profits of the Agnostic,—those wretched Muslims might see again the vision of hope and faith and regain the immortal glories of the Mujahid. Iqbal was hardly a poet or a preacher: he was one of those great souls who are born at great intervals and revolutionise their times. His was the destiny to bring about a revolution in the dormant thought of Indian Muslims and to prepare them for an active revolution. Long before he delivered his famous and historic sermon in the Allahabad session of the All-India Muslim League in 1930, wherein he put forth concrete proposals for the

formation of a North-Western Muslim Bloc in India, he had devoted his life and his poetry—the medium of his inner life—to the cause of the Millat and to its rejuvenation. The hero of his poetry and the centre of his philosophy was the Ideal Man (*Mard-e-Momin*) who is nothing but a replica of a true Muslim who lives for his God, who strives for his God and who dies for his God. Such Muslims were universal in the early days of Islam and some of them have existed in every time and place. But never had the moral standard of a Muslim fallen so low as in the last hundred years, and nowhere so as in India. An average Indian Mussalman was almost the very opposite of *Mard-e-Momin*; and so Iqbal held out the mirror for the modern Muslim to see the contrast. But Iqbal was an optimist: he had firm faith in the eternal destiny of Man and in the revival of Islam as a universal force. For this, he promised his brethren that not only power in this life but the highest secrets of the earth and the Heaven would be theirs provided they rekindled in their breasts the same fire that inspired the early Muslims. That fire

is nothing but the fire of faith or *Soz-e-Yaqeen*—the Divine fire that turns men into supermen and scattered groups of people into living nations. The only hope for Muslims, therefore, was in falling back to the original faith in themselves and their God, which would give them at once an ideal and the practical means to fight for that ideal.

غلامی میں نہ کام آئی ہیں شمشیریں نہ دندریں
 جو ہو دوں نعلں پیدا ہو کٹ حانی ہیں رنجیریں
 کوئی اندازہ کر سکتا ہے اس کے زور دارو کا
 نگاہ مرد موم سے بدل حانی ہیں نقدہریں
 یقین محکم، عمل یدہم، مسحت فاجع عالم
 جہاد زندگی میں ہیں نہ مردوں کی شمشیریں

This Divine faith, realising itself in *Khudi*, is the means, then, by which the Muslims can rise from their moral and material degradation and achieve their true freedom.

Freedom is the very essence of a Muslim's life—especially of a life Islamic. A Muslim in fetters is a blot on the Faith and a burden on the Millat. Iqbal found the main symptom of the moral disease of the Muslims

in their political serfdom, and what is more, in their active acquiescence in that serfdom. Could there be a state of downfall more abject for a nation than the one in which it had lost consciousness of its slavery—more so for the Muslim nation for whom freedom has a lofty meaning? Freedom for Muslims is synonymous with Goodness and Power : and this serves only as the means to a higher end. Freedom is not worth achieving for Muslims if it means only a selfish freedom for a group of people exclusive of, or at the cost of, others. True freedom for a Muslim means a state or condition in which he may be free to “enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong,” to usher in the reign of truth and justice, and to establish the Kingdom of God on earth !

تأمرون بالمعروف وتنهون عن المنكر وتؤمنون بالله

Iqbal's conception of freedom—his “Pakistan”—is a *positive* one. It is not born of the fear of others or a selfish desire to safeguard the political and economic rights of the nation—which is but a narrow conception based on the negative nationalism of modern Europe. Pakistan for Muslims will

be a symbol of their national awakening in which they will not only be free from alien control or domination but will themselves give freedom and enlightenment to others around them. The chief target of Iqbal's attack was British Imperialism. His universal eye had seen how this most vicious form of modern Machiavellism had cut at the root of light and liberty everywhere in the world, and in this process had become the arch-enemy of Islam. There could be no hope for Muslims—whether of India or China or Egypt—as long as this Imperialism held sway in the world; even as for a full and free revival of Islam in the modern world, the Dark Age of materialism and selfish tyranny must first be ended. Iqbal's enmity was aimed not against the British people, but against the system of power and exploitation which they had established in the East.

ترا نادان امید غمگساری ها ز افرونگ است
دل شاهی نه سوزد بهر آن مرغی که در چنگ است

For him there could be no compromise between Islam and foreign domination in any form. Islam meant freedom of the soul so

that it may best serve God—and this was real Pakistan.

But in India the Muslims were facing a double problem. What if the British went away only to be supplanted by a worse form of imperialism—that is, of the Hindus? Iqbal's conception of *Khudi* was too lofty to think in terms of a Hindu imperialism over Muslims. The Hindus, even though greater in number, could never become powerful enough to rule over Muslims unless they were actively aided by the British. In his whole poetry—full of scathing condemnation of Western materialism and its chief pillar, the British Imperialism—he never visualises the possibility of a Hindu tyranny in India, nor does he emphasise the fundamental differences between Muslims and Hindus. Still, far-sighted as he was, he had seen the *potential* friction between the two nations living in a free India. Hence his mind began to work on the idea of a separate Muslim state in India—although in such a way that it would not be unwelcome to the Hindus, and would pave the way to India's freedom. In fact, Iqbal was thinking in terms of a Muslim India within India and as

an integral part of the country, even while his mind was filled with the vision of a great Muslim hegemony extending from the Indus to the Nile. Here are his momentous words which he addressed to the Muslims in 1930

“Communalism, in its higher aspects then, is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India. The units of Indian society are not territorial as in European countries. India is a continent of human groups belonging to different races speaking different languages and professing different religions. Their behaviour is not at all determined by a common race-consciousness. Even the Hindus do not form a homogeneous group. The principle of European democracy cannot be applied to India without recognising the facts of communal groups. The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is therefore, perfectly justified. The resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference at Delhi is to my mind wholly inspired by this noble idea of a harmonious whole which, instead of stifling the respective individualities of its component wholes affords them chances of fully working out the possibilities that may be latent in them. And I have no doubt that this house will emphatically endorse the Muslim demands embodied in this resolution. Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. I would like to see the

Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-Government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India."

This was the first concrete shape of the latent demand for a Muslim India—though the name "Pakistan" had not yet been given to it. Iqbal who had dug up and destroyed all the tottering edifices of Muslim decadence, had also prepared the ground for Muslim renaissance and had even laid the foundation for the Muslims to build their new structure upon. Only the foundation he had laid was one of freedom, love and truth ; and if ever Pakistan is raised, it will be on these very foundations.

Meanwhile, the Muslims who had been leashed to some activity with the dawn of the new century, were vacillating between a pro-British and a pro-Congress policy. They had yet to stand on their own legs and enter a positive struggle for their own freedom as well as for the freedom of India. After the formation of the Muslim League in 1906, the

Muslims owed a double, and very often a simultaneous, loyalty to both League and Congress. The real Congress-League union came in 1916 with the Lucknow Pact, which marked the first Hindu-Muslim reunion after the Mutiny. The League and the Congress, for a while, became synonymous terms for both Hindus and Muslims. Then on, while the more conservative and reactionary elements in the Muslim leadership stuck to their armchairs and remained aloof from the main current of revolution, the progressive and freedom-loving Leaguers joined hands with the (as yet sincere) Congress in the wave of successive Civil Disobedience and Khilafat Movements that rocked the country from 1919 to 1922. That was the apex of India's revolutionary ardour, and independence seemed at hand. But even before it had been reached half-way, a gigantic hurdle suddenly appeared in the shape of a growing imperialistic vein in the Congress. Mr. Gandhi began to think of usurping total leadership of the Khilafat Movement in order to use it as a Congress monopoly against the Muslims; while at the same time the reactionary elements of Muslim

leadership, instead of rallying together to fight this disease in the Congress, began to cut loose from the current of revolution under the pretext of saving their community. Hindu-Muslim unity began to cleave on the altar of power-politics. Communal riots, inspired by such Mahasabhaite Congress leaders as Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, appeared as sore spots all over the face of India. And all this was secretly but successfully engineered by the British, who were alarmed by the growing threat of Indian unity and revolt and saw in it the first real challenge to their power.

From now on the basis of Congress policy was to capture power in India in the name of democracy and freedom—regardless whether that power would mean real freedom for the Indian people or not. With this aim the Congress entered into open hostility with that Muslim element which sought to retain its distinct identity as a politico-national group, and thus indirectly compelled the bulk of Indian Muslims to drift away from the joint struggle of independence. The British too encouraged this drift as it took the wind out of Congress sails on the one hand, and put a

timely check on the growing political consciousness among the Muslims. In these circumstances, the Muslim separatist movement had already gained some ground when the climax was reached in 1937 with the Congress refusal to form coalition with League members, who had lately been elected with Congress alliance and support. The Congress was at the height of its power—and at the height of its arbitrary totalitarianism. It had offered the most humiliating terms to the Muslims and had spurned the hand of co-operation unless the Muslims surrendered their national identity and merged themselves in the Congress. The case for Muslim separatism had triumphed. The Congress had exposed itself as a fascistic body, heading on the road of ambition towards a new imperialism. There was no room in it—argued the disgruntled Leaguers who had now gone into Opposition—for any Muslim who believed in his own free and honourable national existence. The Muslim League, which had upto now been a disjointed and loose organisation, depending sometimes on Congress goodwill and at others on British support, now began to swell its

ranks. Muslims from both sides began to come to the League fold. They came from Congress ranks which had become too hot for their Islamic self-respect and national identity. And incidentally, they also came from those reactionary and pro-imperialist elements in Muslim society which had kept themselves aloof from the struggle of independence, and had even fought the League itself in the last elections as henchmen of the foreign power : now they came to swell the League ranks and to capture it, only because the League was now opposing the Congress. These were the same knighted gentry, landlords, capitalists and opportunists for whom freedom or nationalism had no meaning, but who now posed as the greatest patriots so that they may demand their rights and retain their privileges in the future political set-up of India. Thus, while the League was fast becoming a mass organisation, representing millions of mute and hungry Muslims of India, its higher rank and file and even its leadership were being corrupted by the inroads of these self-seeking elements. The greatest boon of these developments, however, was

that the Muslims embarked upon a positive, definite and independent line of action for achieving their freedom. Whether that freedom would be achieved, and when it would be achieved, would depend ultimately upon the Muslims' own inherent strength.

In these conditions it was that the Lahore session of the All India Muslim League met in 1940—ten years after Iqbal had given the first picture of Pakistan—to adopt the idea of a separate sovereign Muslim state in India. It passed the following resolution

“Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic plan, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial adjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North Western and Eastern Zones of India should be grouped to constitute an ‘Independent State’ in which the constituent units will be autonomous and sovereign.”

At last the League had formally accepted what for years had remained a vague and undefined yearning of the Muslim nation and

which, due to Congress and British policies, had also become the need of the hour. But the League had only presented a bare outline and had left all those details and colours which were essential to make it a coherent map, to be filled in by mutual negotiations, and failing that by developments of time. In fact, the League and those who moulded its policy were themselves not fully aware of the potentialities of Pakistan, nor sure of how this dynamic conception of Muslim nationalism would progress. They had taken over the idea hesitatingly, and had even ridiculed it 'a few years back when it was presented to them at the time of the Round Table Conference in London in 1931 by a set of Indian Cambridge students under Chowdhry Rehmat Ali. Chowdhry Rehmat Ali remains one of those legendary figures whose name will always be associated with Pakistan, but of whose life and activity little is known to have been associated with the Muslims' actual struggle for independence in India. While he was still a young enthusiastic under-graduate in England, he founded his Pakistan National Movement and concentrated all his energies

and activities on explaining his idealistic schemes to eminent thinkers and politicians, both British and Indian. He began well with advocating the cause of a separate sovereign Muslim state in India, and gave out his first "Pak Plan" for the "immediate setting up of a North-Western Muslim Bloc comprising the Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, N.-W.F.P. and Kashmir": (P-a-k-stan literally stands for Punjab, Afghanis—meaning the Frontier Pathans—, Kashmir, Sind, and Baluchistan). Then, even before this first and elementary Pakistan had been achieved or accepted, the Chowdhry quietly went on to work upon the scheme by producing a series of Pak Plans for "Bangistan", "Osmanistan", "Hyderistan" and so forth—until he had produced more than a dozen Pakistans, all on paper, and was himself completely lost in the labyrinth. Chowdhry Rehmat Ali was purely an idealist and could not stand his ground when faced with realities or summoned by the call for action. He is still—after fifteen years—busy evolving schemes and explaining them to people from his Cambridge home, while much water has rolled down the Ganges. It

was this Rehmat Ali who, after he had given the first concrete shape to the idea of Pakistan and had given it a name, sent out his emissaries to India (those same fellow-under-graduates who were now passing out of Cambridge and returning to their home) to explain the idea to the Muslim League and convert its leaders. At first the young ambassadors of Pakistan received a cool reception in India. Gradually, though influenced by the internal situation in the country, Mr. Jinnah began to grow sympathetic to the idea and asked its authors to present it in writing. That was before 1938. In that year Dr. Syed Abdul Latif, who was then in close association with the League leadership, drew up a detailed scheme (partly on his own behalf and partly on behalf of the League) for the creation of an Indian Confederation. In this Confederation, there would be a Union Centre with powers of Defence, External Affairs and Commerce, and the whole of India would be divided into autonomous states or units with full residuary powers—while the Muslims would have their own states defined on a cultural basis in the

North-West, in East Bengal and parts of Assam, and in Hyderabad. If Rehmat Ali's plan was purely territorial, Dr. Latif's scheme was essentially cultural. Yet, of all the schemes that have emanated from time to time since then, the one by the Hyderabad Doctor seems to be the most sensible or nearest to sense ; as it has the germs for being worked up into a national and not merely a territorial solution of the Indian Muslims' complex problem, as was later proved by the Cabinet Mission's scheme which, though following in main the pattern of Dr. Latif, leaves out his essential features for protecting the integrity and autonomy of the Muslim regions and for safeguarding the interests of Muslims in the rest of India. These various schemes and plans, however, were yet to be knit together by the growing national upsurge of the Mussalmans before they were resolved into a positive and unified national demand. The Muslims and their Pakistan had still a long and arduous way to go. The Muslim League which had taken upon itself the heavy responsibility of carrying on the demand of Pakistan and of fighting for it on

behalf of the hundred million Muslims of India, had the task ahead of instilling a true and definite spirit of Pakistan into the Muslim hearts, of steering it through Congress hostility and readjusting it with Hindu interests, and lastly of winning it in a courageous, protracted and positive struggle from the British.

But Pakistan came as a bombshell on the Hindus, and as a dilemma for the British, while the Muslims were swept on its wave into a deluge of national fervour. The Congress, which in the beginning had viewed the project at least not with disapproval, now began to oppose it tooth and nail, fearing in it a potential rival to its own dreams of power and majority rulership. The British who in the beginning showed neither sympathy nor apathy to Pakistan, found it a good counter to use for their own ends, while they secretly dreaded the prospect of a revival of Muslim power in India which was still their greatest potential enemy. They decided on a policy of "active non-intervention": whereby they would encourage the idea as long as it served to sow discord among

Indians, but the moment it threatened to assume the proportions of a struggle of liberation, it would be opposed and crushed. Thus, while the British Tories were professing lip-sympathy to the aspirations of the Muslims and putting forward the communal question as an argument against Indian independence, they never failed to emphasise that India was geographically one and that a division or vivisection of India was unthinkable. The British have always wanted unity of India, and disunity among Indians. And the Muslims who should have by now chosen a definite stream for steering their ship, merely left it at the mercy of the waves. Having put forth Pakistan, they were so overwhelmed with the idea that they forgot to act.

The World War II created peculiar problems. The case for India's freedom, together with the case for Pakistan, was put in cold storage. The Muslim League decided to hold up its agitation in order to give a free hand to the British to fight out their enemies in Europe and Asia. The Congress, however, was more clever to have utilised the oppor-

tunity of the fallen British fortunes in the war, to press for its own demand of Swaraj. The Congress may have been unjustified in demanding the transfer of full power into its own hands under the garb of a democratic self-government, but it was perfectly justified in demanding an award of freedom as a price for its co-operation in the imperial war effort, and by no stretch of fair imagination could it be blamed for indirectly helping the Axis when the Axis was its enemy's enemy. While it is certain that German and Japanese imperialisms if victorious would have been worse for the world, it has also been proved by history that those nations which utilised their aid with tact and courage for their own struggles of independence (like Indonesia and Indo-China) have gained their freedom more quickly than those which aided the Allied cause (like Egypt, and largely speaking, India and China). But the British, who were getting enough Indian war effort without the help of the Indian political parties, were in no mood to appease the Congress further than the concessions offered in the Cripps Proposals. The Cripps Proposals, it

must be said, offered at least a semblance of independence as well that of Pakistan: yet both Congress and League rejected them, though each for its own peculiar reasons. The Congress did not look with favour on the clause of secession provided in the plan, while the League was not satisfied with the right of secession granted only to the provinces instead of the Muslim nation. As if these could matter for a people who were really earnest for their independence!

The Congress proved more stubborn and intransigent, and went into wilderness. The Muslims mistakenly thought that this downfall of the Congress was an indirect step towards the goal of Pakistan; whereas it was only a retrogressive step, for a nail in the coffin of Indian independence will always be a nail in the coffin of Pakistan. Only, for the Muslims the struggle had become doubly hard—against the British and against the Congress. So, when Congressmen came out of jails in 1945 they were physically weak but morally stronger, while the League which had remained on the defensive was strong physically but morally weaker. It had failed to

demonstrate its potential force that might be used against the British in winning Pakistan. And as British policy has historically been one of siding with the strong as against the weak—so the foundation was laid for a new strategy, wherein the British and the Congress were now on to be the allies, and the Muslims the target. This tacit Anglo-Hindu alliance was bound with natural and closer ties: whereby Britain would buy a friendly India with the price of a “free” India, and the Congress would sell the real freedom of India for the reward of a “united” India. It was mutually agreed that Pakistan was to be buried. The series of conferences held in Delhi and Simla under the benevolent guidance of the Viceroy proved this anti-Muslim front to the hilt. They were just fitting epilogues to the Gandhi-Jinnah talks at Bombay where Pakistan was refused from one side, and a condition was put on independence from the other. What remained to be done now was to put off that freedom indefinitely and to crush Pakistan.

The Simla Conference of July 1945 which met amid high hopes of a Congress-League

settlement, and which was convened under professions of British good faith, demonstrated that the Congress and the League would never agree except when the British wanted them to—and then they would even forego their basic demands. The British now wanted the League to surrender its Pakistan, and wanted the Congress to surrender its demand of complete independence. The failure or success of the Simla talks depended on two hurdles: the question of "Parity" which the Viceroy had awarded between Muslims and Caste-Hindus on a 50 : 50 basis of representation in the Viceroy's proposed interim national cabinet; and the question whether the League represented all the Indian Muslims or only a majority of them. Parity, on the face of it, was not only a fair solution of the communal tangle but was a reasonable alternative to Pakistan even from the Congress view-point, inasmuch as it retained the basic unity of India while safeguarding the Muslims against majority rule at the Centre. But the Congress would have none of it; it would not have even a compromised Pakistan; and claimed to represent the whole of India. On

the other hand, the League which was having the advantage of Parity as well as a major Muslim representation in the Cabinet conceded to it, insisted that it should be allowed to represent the *whole* Muslim quota and further that no Muslim should be nominated by the Congress even from its own quota. The Muslim League had by now become the "sole, authoritative, representative organisation" of Indian Muslims, and was as such the only spokesman of the collective will of the Muslim masses ; yet the League had to face facts and realities which were standing then in the shape of a Congress Government in the N.-W.F.P., a Unionist Government in the Punjab and a host of Nationalist Muslim organisations in the country. As neither the Congress nor the League would bend on this point, the Conference broke down—finally on the apparently flimsy ground of the inclusion of Malik Khizr Hayat Khan in the Muslim quota, a ground which was unnecessarily emphasised by the Government in order to lay the blame on League doors. The Viceroy had played his cards well, and while the burden rested on the Indian parties, the British

power found a new lease of life in India. The Indian people, and especially the Muslim people, began to wonder whether their freedom was not being played as a ball between the power-politics of British and Indian political parties. Was that the reason why Britain had taken such a helping hand in the creation of party system in India?

But Britain, who in the stress of war had made a high and definite promise of independence to the Indians before the bar of world opinion, and who emerged none-the-better as a victor, was now feeling compelled to fulfil that promise—if not in spirit, at least in letter. The failure of the Simla Conference had served at least one good purpose. It had proved finally that there was no compromise possible on Pakistan, and henceforth if the Muslims wanted to save themselves or to rise, they must set out to achieve their full freedom whole-heartedly and actively. The Congress would not help or even tolerate it. And it was futile to expect it from the British Government which was decided on her post-war policy to appease the Congress for securing India as a friendly and stable

base in the East. The only course now open to the Muslims was to rely on their own strength. They had to struggle now both against the British and against the Congress. The call of the hour was : Unity and Action. After the failure at Simla, the fate of Pakistan seemed to hinge on the test whether the Muslims of India stood unanimously in demanding Pakistan. The answer could best be furnished by the people themselves at the polls. The new Labour Government of Britain ordered general elections in India and sent out a Parliamentary Delegation to gather the back-ground material for the new Indian stage to be set after the elections.

CHAPTER III

"Direct Action"

If free and fair elections could decide the fate of Pakistan, then Pakistan would have been won in the general elections of 1946. For, despite the heavy odds against the Muslim electorate in almost all the provinces--the growing hostility of British Imperialism, the open enmity of Congress politicians and capitalists, and the opposition by Nationalist Muslims--the overwhelming mass of popular Muslim opinion readily declared itself in favour of a free and separate state for the great Muslim nation. In Sind the response to the Muslim ideal was clear and even G. M. Syed's dissenters declared themselves for Pakistan. Assam proved a special hotbed of Congress intrigue and tyranny against Muslims, Adibasis and other hill tribes, but *Assamese Muslims who form the largest single group in the province* declared strongly for

DIRECT ACTION

Pakistan. The Frontier, where the Congress succeeded in forming a ministry, would never go against Pakistan in a plebiscite. While the thunderous reply of the Punjab and Bengal to the call of Muslim freedom echoed in every corner of India.

But, obviously, the verdict at the polls would not give India her freedom, nor to Muslims their Pakistan. There was a grim fight ahead for India, and there was a double conspiracy of power against the Muslims. The British who found their Empire tottering, and the Congress who saw a golden opportunity to usurp power over India in the name of nationalism, were now finding a common ground against Muslims who stood between their unholy rapprochement. Never before had Muslim India—as indeed the Muslim world—faced such enormous combination of power against itself. This was clearly an hour of struggle—not an hour of merriment or ministry-making. The formation of ministries in the provinces or at the Centre at this stage would jeopardise the Muslim demand for Pakistan and would compromise the case of India's freedom—(as

actually happened afterwards). We should have had no truck with the 1935 Constitution or with any constitution based on a fallacious idea of unity and democracy. We had to show to the British Cabinet Mission which was now coming to India that we were adamant on our demand, and we could best demonstrate our adamance by our refusal to be dictated by the British or to be forced to work any of their arbitrary constitutions, past or future.

The Congress (now thoroughly exposed as a communal organisation) had by its crafty manoeuverings, malicious propaganda and black-market expenditure sought to create disruption in the Muslim ranks by supporting the centrifugal elements in the nation. On the other hand, the present constitution of India was grossly unfair to the Muslims, as by giving an India-wide "weightage" to the provincial minorities it had given still more "weightage" to India's majority community, while it had not materially altered the position of Muslims in their minority areas and had actually reduced them to a minority in their majority

provinces. Thus, while in Sind where they form the bulk of the population, they were just a bare majority in the legislature. In Punjab and Bengal they could not even form a pure majority ministry without outside assistance. The result of this double disadvantage was that the Muslims were left with no potent constitutional force anywhere in India, even after their success in the elections. And to add insult to injury, the Congress refused the hand of co-operation offered by the League in Muslim provinces, and itself refused to offer that hand in Hindu provinces, but instead went and set up an all-party anti-Muslim front by coalescing with other minority parties and even with the agents of British Imperialism, as in the Punjab. Under these circumstances, it could not be proper for the Muslims to form coalition governments with their sworn opponents or to run the constitution for other people's benefit—though the League did form two rather unstable ministries in Sind and Bengal. The Muslims were fighting for Pakistan ; they had not fought these elections just to run the ministries or to beg their

rights of the British and of the Congress. Though initial victory had been won at the polls, they were still a long way off their cherished goal, and the Muslims had yet to learn how to work in opposition and thus form themselves into a formidable force to repulse the joint attack of the British and the Congress if and when it came. The road to Pakistan was not strewn with roses. It was a thorny uphill road of struggle, blood, sweat and sacrifice. Let only those who would fight come in; the rest might fall out.

The historic Convention of half a thousand League Legislators drawn from all over India met in Delhi under the shadow of this great crisis. The newly elected representatives of the Muslim masses took the oath of loyalty to the sacred cause and pledged their lives to Pakistan. This historic Convention was more than an assembly of Legislators; it was the Muslim constitution-making body, the nucleus of the constituent assembly for Pakistan and in fact the body which—whether the British granted self-determination to Muslims or not—would set up a free constitution for India. At this

time, too, the British Cabinet Mission which had come over to this country, was entering upon the most crucial phase of its deliberations. The British Ministers and the Viceroy had held preliminary discussions with party leaders and gauged the opinions of the parties and indirectly of the people. They must have by now formed a definite picture of the future political set-up of a free India, to be born of a fair re-adjustment of the rival claims of the various groups. Above all, they would have seen the grim determination and the rock-like solidarity of the Muslims and the justness of their claim for an honourable existence in this country. What was the straight and fair course open to the Cabinet Mission? If the British power and the Hindu people wanted peace with Muslims, they would realise that the Muslims are a nation. If the Muslims are a self-respecting and honourable nation, they must be conceded the right of self-determination. And if a nation has a right to determine its own future, no power on earth can deprive it of its legitimate sovereignty, and incidentally of an independent home-land of its

The Cabinet Mission had to realise that there was no question of "a minority vetoing the advance of the majority," but the question was whether any one nation (whether a majority or a minority) had the right to stand in the way of another nation's freedom and demand a monopoly of power over the whole land. If there was to be real freedom, it must be freedom for both the nations and for all the peoples of India, and in that way the Muslim nation's demand for Pakistan would be an essential condition to independence.

It was the duty of the British Ministers to work out a settlement on this basis, and if the majority-nation persisted in its fascistic attitude of demanding the whole, then the only honourable course for the Mission would be either to concede Pakistan to the Muslims, or to leave India to the Indians—in fact, to "quit India"—but without transferring power to any particular party or nation. But alas, the British Cabinet Mission succumbed to the temptation of a profitable alliance with the majority, in return for a sham independence which in effect would

mean continuation of British military power and safeguarding of British commercial interests in India ! By their clever but dubious award of May 16th, the Mission offered to hand over the complete machinery of governmental power to the majority-nation and its capitalist-ridden party, thereby forcing compulsory and infinite servitude on the Muslims.

“Pakistan is dead—long live Pakistan,” could well be the cry now of the disheartened Muslim who had pinned all his hopes on an early realisation of complete Pakistan, and was standing ready for the hardest struggle and sacrifice. Now he was told to wait and watch and move cautiously—and God willing the goal would be reached in a peaceful and gradual manner in another ten or hundred years to come. The Muslims could not question the decision of the All-India Muslim League Council at New Delhi to accept the Cabinet Mission proposals unconditionally. But the Muslims were asking : “We want peace for the country and freedom for our nation. But should peace be at the cost of our honour, and can freedom be won without

sacrifice ? ” The answer to this question lay in the new British plan for India, and more so in the lessons of history. The plan, instead of healing the old British-made breach between Hindus and Muslims had all the more widened it, and had sown the seed of perpetual discord by forcing them to live together and yet live separately. This was not surprising to the sane Indian—Muslim or Hindu—who saw in it a clever imperialist ruse to maintain alien power in India. The era of “ divide-and-rule ” had given place to the era of “ unite-and-rule.” Only the strategy had changed. The Muslims by accepting a plan which—though giving them a shadow of Pakistan in the shape of impotent Groups—had denied to them the fundamental right of sovereignty and the status of a nation, would lower their position for any future political bargaining and would undermine their potential strength for any future struggle for freedom. By accepting the scheme the Muslims must find themselves in a trap from which it might be impossible for them to extricate themselves. For, now the Muslims were on equal terms with the Hindus and

could dictate terms to both the Hindus and the British. But once the Muslims merged themselves into a single constitution, with a single Union Centre and under a single Indian army controlled by the majority party—all backed by British bayonets and Imperial preference, in alliance with Hindu capitalism—would they ever be able to assert their rights or to rise for their freedom? They would be like soldiers whose hands and feet have been cut off.

A soldier a Muslim has always been, a soldier of peace and goodwill. And because of this very selflessness, he has always been brave, and a formidable power for his opponent. The Muslim decline in India began when the Muslims ceased to be brave and selfless. As Iqbal said: "The reward of weakness is death inglorious." Could the Muslims then rise again in Hindustan unless they rekindled in their breasts the divine fire of Islam—the fire that burns only for truth and knows no extinction in face of adverse winds. Islam is faith, and faith follows only the straight course of peace and honour—not the course of diplomacy and armchair states-

manship. A true Muslim does not know "strategic withdrawal." The Muslims of India were standing at a point from where there was no retreat. They must either march forward or perish. Having committed itself to the lofty ideal of a free Muslim state in India which may become the leader of Islamic renaissance in the world, the Muslim nation was honour-bound to redeem its pledge of Pakistan, not merely for its own existence in India, but for the wider commonwealth of Islam. Pakistan was our minimum and immediate demand—and though we might enter into a working compromise on other points, we must not relax our struggle for this basic, national demand, if we had to attain it now as we had promised. A going back on Pakistan now—under any form—would mean a going back on all that the Muslim nation was standing for. But Islam lives on, whether the Muslims live or not. Especially after every defeat for the Muslims, after every Karbala, the victory for Islam is assured. The world of Islam had risen to wipe out all the forces of darkness and aggression wherever they be, and if the

Muslims of India forsook their role of leadership of the Muslim world, they would spell their own doom and would be replaced by other nations more worthy of the cause of God. But nay, the Muslim people—the real nation—had responded to the call of faith and were ready to march forward. They were inspired not by political considerations, not by economic interests, not by diplomatic moves, but mainly by the righteousness and justness of their cause. It was now up to the Muslim leadership to feel the pulse of time, to be inspired by the same ideals, to purge itself of all reluctant and reactionary elements, and then to guide the nation on the road of peace and honour. In any case, the Muslim nation would march on.

The Congress' conditional rejection of the Cabinet Mission's proposals, and the League's unconditional acceptance of them were in sharp contrast. While it showed that the League accepted what it should not have accepted—namely, peace without honour—the Congress attitude was nothing but the highest intransigence which aimed at neither peace nor honour. And the attitudes

of both League and Congress were one with that of the British Mission in denying freedom to India. For, as the plan had turned out to be, it was at once a rejection of Pakistan and independence, and was only a trap cleverly laid for both Hindus and Muslims to fall into and knock their heads against each other—or as an alternative to surrender jointly to the British might. We could have no truck with the Cabinet Mission's malicious scheme for a British protectorate of United India—if we had to survive as a nation, if we had to make India free. The freedom of India must now be near to every true Muslim's heart even as the freedom of Islam. But the British plan was to deny both the freedoms with a single stroke. The British Ministers' off-hand rejection of Pakistan and the proposed establishment of a Union Centre was not only a refusal to recognise the sovereignty of Muslim state but in fact a denial of Muslim nationhood. The federal Government at the Centre, in spite of all its checks and balances which would make it inefficient but not weak, would for all purposes mean a one-party rule in India. Guarded by the

three supreme central subjects: Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications with their own finance and with a central executive and legislature in which there would be *no parity*, the new Government would enjoy the full sovereignty of a single state, with a standing army to enforce it on reluctant province or groups. The Grouping of provinces, again, into Hindu and Muslim zones improved nothing upon the basic provincial autonomy still enjoyed by them. The all-supreme right to secede—the right of self-determination—had been cleverly left to the mercy of the constitution-making body which, with its majority vote would never concede it. Above all, after the rejection of sovereignty and self-determination to the Muslims, the semblance of autonomy had been granted only to the provinces on a territorial basis and not to the great Indian Muslim nation which had stood up as one man for its demand of Pakistan.

But the plan—perhaps happy for India, and especially for the Muslims—foundered on the very first rock, the Interim Government. The Muslim League, after having

surrendered everything (partly for the sake of mutual peace and partly for the internal weakness of the organisation) had stuck to the last straws of parity at the Centre and grouping of the provinces. But the Congress, having got everything it wanted, still clamoured for its pound of flesh with no other object but to secure full domination over the Muslims from the very first day. The Congress, it seemed, would not have freedom if it also meant even a shadow of freedom for Muslims. The Congressmen's game, ever since the British Ministers' announcement, was to wait and watch and manoeuvre till they could convert the plan into an award for Akhand Hindustan pure and simple. For this they launched a campaign of clarification after clarification so that the question of parity, of grouping of provinces and of the status of the Constituent Assembly might all be decided in their favour. They would not mind if the question of freedom was put in cold storage, if the constitution of an independent India was never to be drawn up, and if British troops were never to withdraw from the land—as long as their

DIRECT ACTION

outrageous demands for a Hindu majority in the Central Government, a one-sided "sovereignty" in the Constituent Assembly, and their own interpretation on Grouping and Communal Veto were being conceded. The British, however, would concede everything but freedom, and with this end in view they placated the League and the Congress by turns. So it just happened that it was the turn of the Congress to be placated now, and the British Government went back on their word to form a Government with the Muslim League in case of Congress refusal, and failed to guarantee a strict adherence to the original State Paper. But the Muslims had no cause either to be sorry or to rejoice, for whether the British granted Hindu-Muslim parity in the Interim Government or not, they had in their plan left the Muslims totally and permanently at the mercy of the majority; had made the provinces masters of the Groups, and the Union Centre the master of them all. If with such an award the Indians were going to be satisfied, they had no right to freedom. But the Congress by accepting the offer in practice

and rejecting it in principle, had finally banged the door on any settlement, at least on any settlement under the benevolent protection of the third power.

It must have now opened the eyes of those Muslim Leaguers who thought they could have the gift of Pakistan from the British or who aspired to win the battle of freedom through political bargaining and diplomacy. They must now learn to act, to act peacefully but bravely and to achieve not only a free Pakistan but also a free India. For it was certain now that Pakistan was impossible without a free India. The one could not be had without the other. Were the Muslims now going to play the shameful role of spectators and be the passive dice in the Imperial game, or were they going to play their ancient and honourable role of makers of peace and torch-bearers of truth and liberty in this inglorious land? The British had failed. The Congress had failed. It was now up to the Muslims to demonstrate their love of freedom and their love of justice. They should have now embarked on a bold policy of action, and should have offered the

hand of co-operation to all the sincere freedom-loving elements in India including Hindus, and should have made common cause with them to drive out the British—the arch-enemy of freedom. Let the Congress capitalists and British Imperialists be defeated at their common game—by the joint efforts of the Indian people—under the leadership of Muslims. Let the Cabinet Mission's plans of “constitution-making” and Viceregal schemes of “interim government” be buried alive, let a new and vigorous leadership arise from among the people, and let us all march together towards a real Pakistan. *For, strange as it may sound, a real, broad-based, free Pakistan would be acceptable to all the peoples of India. It would not be a selfish Pakistan in which Muslim would be cut off from Muslim; it would not be a mockery of Pakistan in which the Muslims would live under the domination of the Hindu or the British; but it would be an ideal state of truth and freedom and the laws of the God.*

The Muslim people of India who in the last elections had returned the Muslim League as their sole representative organisa-

tion were to-day demanding from it a clear and right lead in this most critical hour. For the hour *was* most critical, and a failure on the part of League leadership to mould its policy and its line of action on a sound basis would doom the Muslims to degradation and slavery for years to come. Who was responsible for the hopeless mess in which the Muslims now found themselves? The British Government? Yes! But the British Government never was and would never be a friend of Muslims, and so it was wrong to depend on British words or pledges. Were then the Hindus responsible for the political defeat of the Muslims at the hands of the Congress? Only a weak judgment would blame the Hindus for rallying round the Congress and making it a citadel of Hindu nationalism in their own interests. The truth was that it was only the inherent weakness of the Muslim nation that allowed it to be used as a pawn between the rival imperialisms of the Hindus and the British. And the worst sign of this un-Islamic weakness of the Muslim nation was that it had forsaken the *positive* struggle for independence for the

negative struggle for survival. The logical outcome of this policy was, that on the one hand a great gulf had been created between the Muslims and the Hindus, and on the other hand the Muslims were left at the ultimate mercy of the British. When at last the Hindu-British twain met—the Muslims stood by-passed! The League, having once taken the pledge for Pakistan could not in fairness leave it. It had no right even to make “strategic” compromises on it, after giving a definite undertaking to the Muslim nation to fight for it. But this was also certain that the only Pakistan now possible was a real, broad-based, free Pakistan—free from the British and the Hindus, broad enough to ensure freedom for the whole of India and for all the Muslims in the land, and built upon the foundations of mutual goodwill and common love for independence. The greatest lesson to be learnt from the Cabinet Mission’s betrayal of Muslims was that Western Imperialism was the arch-enemy of Islam and that there could be no freedom and no Pakistan until the British were defeated and expelled from India first. The

Muslim League's acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's proposals had led it nowhere, because the British were not sincere in their intentions and not honest in their dealings. What was the League going to do now to extricate the Muslims from the Congress-British conspiracy of power? Pakistan was born of a noble origin. It was born of the clarion call of Iqbal who sounded the death-knell of Islam's slavery and Muslim degradation, and urged the Muslims to bold and righteous action. Such a conception of Pakistan was too virile to meet set-backs either from the British or from the Hindus and was the only way to true freedom. If the League was the true representative of the Muslims and if its leaders were the sincere friends of the masses, it must rise above the levels of party politics and must give its bold lead for freedom. Whether the League accepted or rejected the Cabinet Mission's plan was now immaterial, for the plan did not lead to independence at all. What would lead to independence was a joint action by the Congress and the League to drive the British out—and then a bold

action by the Muslims to establish Pakistan.

This was the great problem that faced the Council of All-India Muslim League at its session in Bombay. Apparently, the choice before the League Parliament was very delicate—it had either to ratify its previous decision at Delhi and thereby lay all its trump cards in the clever hands of the British and the sinister hands of the Congress; or the League might reject the Cabinet Mission's proposals *in toto* and thus clear out of the picture. But both these courses would be negative and none would directly lead to Pakistan. The need of the hour was that the whole basis of Muslim polity must be changed, the Muslims really be inspired by an intense Islamic love of freedom, they must cease to be exploited by the reactionary or capitalistic elements of their nation and they must unite evermore on a bold positive line of action. God would help! This the Muslim League Council at last seemed to realise, and partly for this realisation and partly because there was no course left open after the British had flatly rejected the Muslim demands and had joined hands with the

Congress, the League said "good-bye to constitutionalism." The Council unanimously rejected the British plan and resolved to launch a movement.

At last the time had come when every Indian Muslim—whatever be his credo and whatever his objections—must prepare himself for action, and through that common will for action, a unity would be forged which would be more real than any superficial political unity. The Muslim League which represented the bulk of Muslim opinion had at last cast off its mantle of political bickering and was now embarking upon a definite programme of "Direct Action." What shape the direct action was going to take? When and how was it going to be launched? Would it invite all the Muslim elements for a joint national struggle for independence? Our unity of action, and even more the successful outcome of it, would depend mainly on whether our struggle was going to be broad-based enough to embrace all the dissenting elements in the Muslim nation or was merely to be a partisan effort to gain more political advantage; and whether the struggle would

be a regular, definite war against the foreign aggressors and internal oppressors with the avowed object of winning freedom for India and Pakistan for Muslims, or was just going to be a war of nerves with only a nuisance value which might create chaos in the land and perpetuate the *status quo* of slavery. For Muslims, it was the supremest hour of trial, when not only their political fate in this country was in balance but when they would also rise or fall by their sincerity to the glorious traditions of Islam. Muslims in every country and in every age have been the torch-bearers of truth and freedom not only for themselves but largely for the whole universe. The Muslims of India, whose unfortunate destiny it was after their downfall in 1857 not only to acquiesce in their own slavery but to play a negative role in Indian politics and contribute to the country's serfdom, had forsaken the lofty ideals of their Faith and forgotten their mission in India—which was : freedom for the whole land and light for its inhabitants through the domination of Islam. Hence the present predicament, when the Hindus whose slavery they

dreaded and the British whose slavery they therefore tolerated, had joined hands. If the Muslims had to survive today the joint Hindu-British raj, they must totally change their outlook and renew their old ideals, they must cease to cling to the vestiges of British goodwill and stop wistfully looking back on British friendship; they must declare that British Imperialism was and would ever be the arch-enemy of Islam; and they must pledge their word and action finally to fight the Imperialists and never to beg or accept Pakistan from them.

Pakistan was no longer a monopoly of the Muslim League or of the Indian Mussalmans, it was now a common heritage of Islam. This much was also true that the old narrow conception of a territorial Pakistan was dead, that it had been buried alive by the Cabinet Mission, the Congress and the League itself, that now the new vision of Pakistan would mean the rise of Islam in the whole of India and the birth of a new force in the Muslim world. And such Pakistan—based as it would be on the lofty ideals of truth and freedom and not merely on the political aspirations of a minority nation—would be

built on the goodwill of all the peoples of India, would work for their social and economic uplift and would ensure their political freedom. It would not be a thing granted by the British, nor for that matter by the Congress. It would be a prize wrested forcibly—moral as well as physical force—from the evil clutches of Imperialists and capitalists.

This was the only Pakistan worth achieving by the Muslims now, and it could only be achieved by the true form of Direct Action. What was the true form of their Direct Action? The Muslims must declare their objectives, define their enemies and determine which of them they had to fight first. And after that, let them gather as many allies and as much goodwill as possible, by calling all the Indian people to the banner of truth and common freedom, and then let them all fight for the great end. Such action would itself bring unity, not only amongst Muslims but also between Indians, and ultimately in the scattered world of Islam. To-day, with God's help and through their own striving, the Muslims were beginning to see the straight path—the path of honour,

courage and truth. They had begun to rely on their own strength. The Muslim League which had, after all, followed the dictates of the nation by rejecting the British Cabinet Mission's sordid plan, had yet to change the whole basis of its policy and the complex of its leadership by chalking out a definite programme of action and defining in clear-cut terms: "Who is our enemy?" The League had yet to decide what it was going to do and against whom. Above all, the Muslims would like to know whether the present attitude was final or was going to change with the ups and downs of British diplomacy. One thing was certain, however, that the Muslim people would never again put any trust in British pledges and promises and would refuse to play the pawn in the Imperial game. The other thing which was equally certain was that the Muslims would never tolerate a Hindu majority tyranny or a one-party Congress rule. This then was their real Pakistan—that is, freedom for Muslims as well as freedom for the whole of India. Now the question was: were the Muslims just going to sit waiting and haggling for a

Congress-British clash so that as a result of that clash the Muslims might get a few crumbs of power and office. Or if that clash did not come off, were the Muslims going to acquiesce in their slavery or to start a negative struggle against authority? Nay, the Muslims were going to end India's political stale-mate and slavery—even if the Congress went and joined hands with the British—and they were determined to launch a direct, hard and active struggle for the freedom of *all* Indians. **The Muslim masses were thinking of a struggle in terms of a revolution.**

If the Muslims were called upon to fight an undeclared war against an undefined enemy, they would not be able to wage it for long or with success. On the other hand, if only the Muslim masses—the toiling labourer, the starving peasant and the honest man-in-the-street—were called upon to put in all the share of sacrifices and bear the whole brunt of battle, while the leaders continued to sit peacefully on the high horse making plans and conducting negotiations, such a movement would hardly evoke a real response in the

nation At best it might sacrifice a few human lives at the alter of Politics But in Islam religion and politics are not different—in fact there is no other politics than Islam—and therefore the Muslim leaders and divines who had upto now guided the political destiny and the spiritual zeal of the Muslims must now take the responsibility of leading the nation in the field of direct action True *Jihad* means to wage war in the cause of God, and that too in self defence and in defence of the Faith, and then to wage it according to a strict moral and military code To make *Jihad* is to declare open war and then to fight it boldly and fearlessly with all the weapons and resources at your command, to spare women and children and the disabled, to fight openly and honestly against a particular enemy who has been warned against, and above all to fight under the direct guidance and leadership of the recognised generals If we were following the true Islamic ideals, if our struggle was solely in the cause of truth and in the service of God Almighty, if our Pakistan was really a fulfilment of Islam's mission in India—then

we must follow the prophet's code of direct action (peace and blessings be on him!). Only thus could we hope to win. But if we degenerated into the ways of our enemies, if we sacrificed Islam for the sake of modern ideologies and political strategies, if we put "Muslim Nation" as more important than Islam itself—we would perish and would be replaced by a people more worthy of the cause of God.

What was then our Direct Action going to be? It must not take the form of civil war—not for the present at least. If it did it would divert all our attention and our energies from our real aim, *viz.*, achieving independence for Muslims as well as for India—which *is* real Pakistan. Maybe in a civil war we gained some temporary tactical advantage by sacrificing a few thousand or million lives of innocent Muslims and non-Muslims, but in the end it would come back to the same British rule. So we had to think of some concrete, positive, constructive steps by which we could achieve Pakistan—by peace if possible, by war if necessary. This might, for instance, be done by making

Muslim areas secede from the Centre and proclaiming their independence, and then challenging any power that might impose its authority—whether British or Hindu. Or as an alternative, we might join hands with Congress (on any terms if necessary) and start a joint revolution against the common enemy of freedom. And lastly, even if, as a last resort, we had to fight a civil war to settle our differences let us have a civil war by all means. But a civil war after the revolution, when there was no third party left to meddle with its sham of non-intervention and reduce the civil war to a farce of slavery. But the hour was critical. We must decide, and decide soon. If we had to survive as a nation and as the torch-bearer of Islam in India, we must decide to act with honour, courage and truth. We must all act as soldiers of freedom and the top-most amongst us must lead the masses by giving a concrete proof of sacrifice. Only if the Muslim leadership was to come out with a bold policy of action—not negative but positive action, directed not merely to create internal chaos but to achieve indepen-

dence—could there be peace in India.

And then, the Muslims had to think and decide upon their future course of action not only in terms of an immediate struggle for Pakistan, but also in terms of the long-range struggle of Muslims in the modern world.

The Congress, which had assumed reins of the first "Indian Government" in British India and was now enjoying the fruits of a sham Swaraj, had got it not through its own efforts nor through British generosity, but as a reward for aligning itself with the Anglo-American bloc in the international field and for promising India's full national war-effort in the future war against Russia. Even as the Western Democracies were heaving a sigh of relief on the defeat of Nazism and were congratulating themselves and their Allies on their common victory, the giant of Russia's rival expansionism began to loom large over their imperialistic ambitions. Just then by a fateful coincidence, the Indian "national" leaders who had all along been sabotaging British Imperialism and even helping its world rivals, began to grow conscious of a new internal enemy in the revolutionary

ardour among the masses and in the rising spirit of Muslim revolt. And so the twain of Britain's "democratic imperialism" and India's "nationalist capitalism" met at last at Delhi. The result of this happy marriage was at once a death knell for freedom and socialism in India. On the one hand Britain retained her Empire and secured a friendly base for strategic use and economic exploitation. On the other hand, India's pseudo nationalist exploiters got their "independence" free of cost and with the additional advantage of securing British might for their external and internal protection.

The Muslims had a lesson to learn from this. They had to learn that they could not achieve Pakistan by mere political bargaining nor by playing a negative role in Indian and world politics—that even if they achieved it, it would be a sham of Pakistan dependent for its existence upon British Congress mercies, that real Pakistan would come after a real positive struggle in alliance with the forces of progress and freedom—against the forces of imperialism and reaction. The Muslims had also to learn that Pakistan

could not hope to live or progress as an isolated spot on earth. It would have to be an integral part within a larger world framework and move in alliance with other groups or nations in order to steer through international cross-currents. Consciously or unconsciously, the Muslims were slowly but steadily drifting towards Russia. "I see a very dark future ahead. If relations between the United States, Britain and Russia worsen, there is no way of telling now which way Indian Muslims may be stampeded at a time of crisis"—said Mr. Jinnah. But what was wanted today—if we really wanted to gain Russian alliance and aid in our cause, and if we wished to take a common line with the Muslim world in any future war—was that we should decide upon a definite and concrete policy of action, instead of playing up the Russian bogey against benevolence, or plodding a lonely course without any friends in India or abroad.

The Muslims had to decide now and definitely what their national and international policy was going to be. Having once decided upon Pakistan, they must first move towards

a Pan-Islamic Federation and take an active lead in it. Secondly, in conjunction and co-operation with the entire Muslim world, they must assign their objectives, their enemies and their allies in the international world, and if necessary for an international conflict. They must strive above all to form a universal Muslim bulwark of peace, progress and freedom—and in any future world war should try to remain neutral. *But if forced to take sides, their sympathies must be with Russia. This would not mean that they should merge themselves into Communism; but that they should assimilate Communism into Islam.* Thus, if they had to progress positively and not merely to play the pawn in the game of foreign powers and internal party politics, they had to declare themselves unconditionally against the Anglo-Americo-Hindustani hegemony today. Failing, they would continue to be exploited by that hegemony on one side, and ignored by Russia and the Muslim countries on the other. They had to choose and act today for Pakistan, for the salvation of oppressed humanity and for the rise of Islam as a universal force. ..

CHAPTER IV

Civil War or Freedom ?

Towards the close of 1946, India was bleeding in the throes of a civil war. Who was responsible for the terrible massacre of human lives in the name of freedom, which put to shame the very honour of India and put off freedom for years to come ? Truth itself was murdered by the evil monopoly of power and political propaganda. While the Government, the Congress and the Muslim League gave their own versions of the great massacres of Calcutta, Noakhali and Bihar, what was the feeling of the vast masses of innocent Muslims and Hindus whose voice was inaudible—in fact the cry of those helpless men, women and children put to the hooligan's sword ? And what was the reaction of the Muslim man in the street who was asking : "How is it that a lakh of Muslims have been killed so mercilessly and

so easily in Bihar—a thing which had never happened to Muslims before, and which pales even the great human tragedy of Hiroshima! It was the voice of the unknown soldier—the real victim, the hero of this carnage, the pawn of politicians and the martyr in the cause of truth and freedom—it was his voice which was trying to be heard in the din of living voices that still cried aloud for peace and freedom where none of them existed.

The main culprit of this ghastly tragedy, which had at one stroke put off Pakistan as well as freedom of India, was the British Government with its age-old callous policy of divide-and-rule culminating in the greatest holocaust of India. When the British realised they could hold the Empire no longer by merely playing up one party against the other, they deliberately planted the seeds of a civil war. The new diplomacy was exposed during the Cabinet Mission's negotiations, when the Mission and the Viceroy, instead of giving a straightforward award of independence to the Indian people by announcing their intention to leave the country by a certain date, carried on fruitless pourparleys

with the political parties, siding now with the one and then with the other, until the gulf of distrust and hatred between them was widened more than ever. Then, when this policy bore fruit in the wave of rioting and mutual hatred, the British failed in their elementary duty to protect human life and maintain law and order in the land, for which they were still mainly responsible. In fact the riots were tacitly encouraged to develop, and British help came in just at the "right" moment when sufficient mischief had already been done and when the world could see that British troops were still the last hope of peace in India. It happened in Calcutta where Premier Suhrawardy called frantically for help for days and Governor Burrows buried himself deep, while the situation went out of control. It happened again in Patna where Premier Sinha pleaded helpless in face of the British Army Commander's refusal to call out troops in time. It was happening everywhere under a dual administration in which, though the Government had seemingly passed into Indian hands the real behind-the-back power was still being wielded by the

foreign Government—with its Viceroy at the Centre, with the Governors in the provinces, and with its agents *provocateur* in every part and township of the country. The responsibility was thus sought to rest on Indian heads and the blame to vary between the Hindu and Muslim. The British might well plead that if Hindus and Muslims quarrelled the British were not to blame. Nor could they be blamed for withholding India's independence as long as the Indians did not agree how to take it. Yes! But the British *were* to blame for misrepresenting one party before the other and misrepresenting the whole of India before the world. First they gave the Muslims to understand that Pakistan was justified and thereby encouraged the Muslim League to carry its demand to the extreme. Then they quietly turned the tables on Muslims by flatly rejecting a sovereign Pakistan in the Cabinet Mission's proposals. And while they were giving out to the world that India was being granted her freedom, what they were actually offering was nothing but a sham Swaraj on the unhealthy basis of Hindu-

British capitalistic alliance in which British military might and British commercial interests would remain paramount in India. The result of this dual diplomacy—which in fact was nothing but old imperialism in the guise of new strategy—had been that mistrust was deep-rooted between one Indian and another which became the prelude to civil war, and India was discredited in the eyes of the world.

The second great culprit in this heinous crime of loot, arson and murder was the Indian National Congress which now really represented only the Hindus and was dreaming of an Empire, and which was acting with fascistic barbarism and medieval tyranny in the name of democracy and freedom. After the first sign of Congress selfishness in 1937, it had grown more and more into a Hindu Grant Junta with its programme of "Muslim mass contact" intended only as a counterblast to Muslim nationalism. To-day it was the Congress in power—at the Centre and in the provinces—which was perpetrating open tyranny on Muslims with its Governments secretly conniving in it, aided by the formid-

able propaganda machinery of a capitalist-controlled "Nationalist" press. The ball was set rolling from Calcutta where the fun started with the local Congress leaders' open incitement of Hindus to mob violence—and all the blame was laid on the League Ministry and on the Muslims of Bengal. To day the Congress had definite imperialistic designs to rule over Muslims and the minorities in much the same way as the British had been ruling over Indians—namely, by divide and rule. Congressmen had even forsaken their professed ideal of freedom and were fast falling for the fruits of office. While they provoked Muslims into hostility and aroused their legitimate suspicions by refusing to share power with them, they went and gladly joined hands with the foreign "enemy" by entering the Interim Government under British sovereignty and accepting a plan which cut at the very root of independence, only because it opposed partition of India. The Congress would now go any length to join the office and capture power (even if it be a sham power), and once in power it would stoop to any tactics to force its regime upon

the minority. Far from making coalitions with the Muslim League (they had refused them in Congress Provinces while they would gladly go and form them in non-Congress and non-Hindu provinces as the Punjab, if only to defeat the Muslim League)—the Congress Ministers had discarded even the elementary civic regard for the freedom and protection of the minority; they were provoking Muslims into rebellion and then cornering them and killing them from both sides. Even in Muslim majority provinces, they would now terrorise the Muslims with sheer dint of their resources in money and power, if not in numbers. But most of the rioting in India was taking place where Muslims were in minority—a sure proof that Muslims were the victims, not the aggressors. The Congress, and those Hindus who fed it, were now so much out to capture power that they were prepared—nay, desirous—for a real civil war. The wind that was sown by them in Calcutta (on Direct Action Day which had been turned by them into anti-Direct Action Day) spread through East Bengal, Bihar and the United Provinces right up to India's capital, while

on the other side Bombay was aflame and any moment the conflagration might spread to the Punjab and other parts of the country. If this ghastly game of retaliation and counter-retaliation—started by the Congress, fanned by the British and carried on by unwitting Muslims—continued, then it was clear that the whole of India would be in flames which would be hard to extinguish for years. Did not the Congress then realise that it was playing with fire? But perhaps it did realise, and wanted the fire. The Congress stood charged not only as an enemy of Muslims but also as an enemy of India's freedom, and particularly of India's mute and hungry masses, both Hindus and Muslims, who were being killed in thousands.

And lastly, the blame for this terrible holocaust rested on the Muslims themselves—the Muslims of India who in their recent history had been playing a role most unworthy of true sense of Islam. If a quarter million Muslims lay slain from Bombay to Bihar, the blame was not so much on the Hindus who had killed them, nor on the British who had helped the killing, but on

the Muslim nation and its own leaders who had *let* them be killed. The Muslim leadership had, guided by weak nations and wrong policy, pursued a reactionary and suicidal course throughout this decade whereby : (1) they unconsciously helped the British and served the interests of imperialism by making no real effort in the way of India's positive advance to freedom and socialism ; (2) they encouraged Hindu communalism and unnecessarily widened the breach between Hindus and Muslims by centering their demand of Pakistan against the Hindus instead of against the British, thus inciting the Hindus to open murderous hostility against Muslims and encouraging the Congress to go and seek alliance with the British as a spite against Muslims ; (3) they gathered the entire Muslim nation under the lofty banner of Pakistan and declared war on its opponents—but made no real or concrete effort to prepare or organise the nation for a struggle except for shouting slogans or casting votes, with the result that the Muslims were organised, but only as a flock of sheep, while their enemies had in the meantime organised them-

selves politically, economically and even militarily. The dire consequence of this hopeless policy was that a terrible carnage of innocent Indian lives—mostly Muslim lives—was taking place, and the leaders and politicians of both sides were still busy negotiating peace on the one hand and threatening an undefined war on the other—nay, even joining in happy coalition in a Government in whose regime the carnage was taking place. Some would even say that if a few thousand Muslim lives were sacrificed, they were well sacrificed for a noble cause and would help in ultimately achieving Pakistan. But the Muslim nation asked them: "Do you not know that it is one thing to die like flies and another to die as soldiers of God? If out of ten crore Muslims, one crore had died fighting on the field of battle and under the inspiring command of our leaders, Pakistan would have already been won and Islam rejuvenated in India. But if even a single Muslim life is wasted on the alter of politics, wasted without a chance to defend itself, wasted while the brother Muslims continue to sit in cosy houses and high offices—the

blood of that Muslim life will cry out for ages and will cry to God for retribution!"

All this had happened, and all this could happen, only because Indians, both Hindus and Muslims, had forsaken their struggles for independence and for Pakistan and were now fighting each other. The rising spirit of the Indian people which had held out the promise of a revolution had degenerated into a spirit of civil war. The harangues of some of the leaders at this time only showed which way the wind was blowing: they stressed more the problem of internal strife than the problem of winning freedom from the foreigner. On the other hand, the spirit of independence had degenerated into a spirit of offices: the way the squibbling and quarrelling politicians hastened to accept seats in the provincial and Central Governments, only proved how keen they were to grab at a fake and fleeting power even if it were in the absence of a long-term settlement and at the expense of real independence. And what should have been a real, straightforward and bold "direct action" on the part of Hindus and Muslims and their representa-

tive political parties against the British (even if their direct actions went on separate and conflicting lines), merely degenerated into an "in-direct action" whereby both parties were aiming at each other, while their common and real enemy was being saved and strengthened.

The British Government with its deft but genial Viceroy, saw in this situation a golden opportunity to save its tottering empire. The seed sown by the Cabinet Mission had borne its full fruit: the Indian parties had basically accepted the Proposals while they were still at loggerheads with each other. What remained to be done now was to manoeuvre them into a position whereby both could be persuaded to surrender their basic demands for independence and for Pakistan, both would enter offices to work the British plans and both would continue to look to the British for support and protection. This was the height of tragedy and the depth to which the Indians could have fallen. Only, the tragedy was more poignant for Muslims who had to fight on two fronts and who had the double duty to free themselves

and to liberate India. The road to Pakistan was harder—and nobler—than the road to Swaraj. And as the British dreaded Pakistan more than they dreaded Swaraj, they embarked upon a policy whereby, in the words of Premier Attlee, “the minority would not be allowed to put a veto on the advance of the majority”, but whereby, both the majority and the minority would be allowed to veto the advance of India’s freedom. While the Congress and the League were haggling over the clauses of the State Paper of May 16, and were lost in the confusion of interpretation, the British Government quietly went on to implement the Proposals—and with the active help of Indians. First they installed the Congress on the *gaddi* of Interim Government and announced the meeting of the Constituent Assembly before any basis was found either for the Interim Government or for the Constituent Assembly to work effectively upon. When they had succeeded in roping the Congress in, they proceeded to rope the League in too—with the motive that the two should not meet except as fellow-slaves, and should not find alliance even

if they worked together. This could only be done by following a zig-zag course in which the Congress was to be placated up to a certain point, and when that point was reached the League was to be brought in to put brakes on Congress ambitions, only to be brushed aside again in favour of Congress restoration to power.

No sooner had Congressmen been enthroned in the Interim Government than they began to think and act as undisputed monarchs of India, though their empire extended, like that of Shah Alam, only from Delhi to Paalam. They became too intolerable even for the British. And so the League was called back from the wilderness. The League was called back not because the British had grown pro-Muslim overnight, or had despaired of Congress friendship, but simply in order, *firstly* to prevent the Muslims half-way from launching their contemplated Direct Action in the field of revolution, and *secondly* to use the League as a scape-goat against the growing Congress power at home and abroad. The new *series of fruitless peace talks and round-*

table conferences which started in Delhi from September 1946 and ended in London in December 1946, was initiated with this very aim. With the League on the brink of Direct Action and with the Congress wearing the unbecoming crown of office, the British Government suddenly realised it had gone too far in appearing one party at the expense of the other and must bring the League back to the fold of compromise and office, if not to the fold of peace and freedom. But the British Government was too closely committed to a pro-Congress policy and to a Hindu-British alliance, to work for any settlement at the expense of Congress displeasure: rather, if at all they worked up a settlement it would be with Congress sanction and even according to the inner dictates of the Congress leaders. The Viceroy-Jinnah, Bhopal-Jinnah and Nehru-Jinnah talks in Delhi were inspired by the British Government mainly with the idea of persuading the League to whittle down its demands in favour of Congress and to withdraw its ultimatum against the British. One glaring proof was that the Chancellor

of Princes, the Nawab of Bhopal, was purposely imported by the Viceroy as a "safe" man who could best play the role of an intermediary and could secure the best terms both from the League and the Congress—terms which would suit the British point of view. The Princely Order, which had been the bulwark of reaction, medievalism and feudal tyranny until now, had suddenly awakened to the changed situation in the country, and was now out to pose as the champion of freedom and democracy. It was seeking to placate the Congress (which was now softening its age-old hostility to the States), and the League (which had not yet entered actively on behalf of State subjects), turn by turn. But underlying all this liberalism of the Princes was their undying faith in British Imperialism which still was so vital to them and so necessary for the survival of their despotic regimes in the new India yet to be born. They also knew that the only hope for their survival was in a Congress-League settlement under British protection and on British terms, even as a voluntary Congress-League settle-

ment on revolutionary lines would spell their doom. Hence the farce in which the Muslim League was sought to be encircled from all sides, not only to preclude the Muslims from any sort of movement, but also to check the advance of India's freedom.

What was the League's position? The League was standing between the Cabinet Mission Proposals of May 16, and the reiterated demand of full and sovereign Pakistan—standing between its own acceptance of the State Paper at Delhi and its flat rejection of the same at Bombay. That is, after it had gone down from its original demand in order to meet the British Proposals, the League had had to retrace its step in face of the "British Betrayal"—their failure to implement Para. 8 of their Plan and to call upon the League to form a Ministry: a process which they later reversed in favour of the Congress. Now again the League had consented to join and work the new constitution, though on the definite understanding that the State Paper would be strictly adhered to and its various

clauses would be interpreted with a definite clarification in the light of the League's renewed demand for a full and free Pakistan. In other words, the League was not going to take another chance of putting trust in British word or to take the risk of depending on Congress assurances. But would it not? After the breakdown of Nehru-Jinnah talks, in which they failed to agree even on such trivial formulas as joint responsibility and Vice-Presidentship of the Cabinet, the League decided to come into the Interim Government "in their own right," on the express Viceregal assurance that the Government would be reformed to give to the League its reserved quota of seats and the portfolios would be reshuffled on a basis of equity, if not of equality. But the Viceroy could not honour even this pledge and could not offer to the League any of the major portfolios except one—Finance. The League was again feeling sorry for having put trust in British words.

When the twain of League-Congress coalition met at long last in Delhi, the move was universally hailed as the first real step

towards resolving the age-old deadlock and achieving India's independence. It was the first time in this country's unfortunate history under British rule that Hindus and Muslims had consented to work together in office—even while they were daggers-drawn outside, and even though they had consented to work only on British terms and on the strength of British bayonets. No wonder that the man-in-the-street was asking: "Is this really a national coalition, and will it last?" It seemed strange that the politicians who would not agree even on small points of party prestige or technical procedure, and would sacrifice the larger national interests for personal whims, would gladly join hands for the sake of a few Cabinet seats which in fact were nothing but crumbs of interim power. It was an artificial alliance, with a strong undercurrent of mistrust and rivalry lurking beneath the false layer of compromise. Could any sane person for a moment imagine that this sort of strange bed-fellowship would last long—much less lead to a permanent understanding between the two political parties or the

nations they represented. At best it might afford an abortive chance to Congress and League politicians to learn to work in co-operation and thrash out their long-range differences through mutual give-and-take in office. But this too proved a futile hope in the midst of the fundamental and inherent differences between League and Congress ideologies and policies which were too deep-rooted to be thrashed out by merely working together in office. Indeed, if anything, these were still more accentuated under the peculiar arrangement of the Interim Government in which, while the seed of discord had been cleverly sown by offsetting one party against the other so that none may wield any power, the real power of veto was firmly held by the Viceroy.

The British super-Government had laid a trap, and the Indian parties had one by one fallen into it. The Cabinet Mission's original plan, which offered neither Pakistan nor a free united India, was worked up in Viceregal hands to prove a meatless bone of contention between the rival claims of Hindus and Muslims. The result was that

though none of the two would agree to a voluntary whittling down of its extreme demands, both of them were persuaded to sacrifice their national ideals of freedom—whether in a united or in a divided India. Thus the British purpose was served. The Congress which had stood high on the rock of intransigence by refusing to surrender its claim of representing the whole of India and by insisting to have monopoly of power in the new Government, now stooped—and stooped low—to conquer. It stooped so low as to forget even its ideal of independence, and agreed to work the Central Government under perpetual British domination in return for a majority rule in the Union Centre. The League, on the other hand, hastened to accept the Mission's vicious scheme which had cut at the very root of Pakistan, but it had no scruples in rejecting the whole scheme merely on small questions of prestige or procedure, only to put trust once again in the oft-broken British word and to join in the Interim Government "on its own strength," which in fact was nothing but British strength. The

Nehru-Jinnah talks and their breakdown were the fruitful culmination of this elaborate imperialist conspiracy. It exposed once and for all the hollowness of the Indian politicians' claim to be fighting for the freedom of Indians, and proved the success of British policy. Why the Congress President would not consent to share the Vice-Presidency of the impotent Interim Government with a Leaguer even in rotation, but he would not mind surrendering the very idea of joint Cabinet responsibility when the League came in, as long as it meant "sticking to our portfolios!" Nor would the League President concede to the Congress the right to represent even those handful of Muslims who were actually in the Congress, though the League lieutenants were now actually working with a Nationalist Muslim in the same Cabinet. The party bosses and rivals were the best of friends, if only as long as the Viceroy wanted them to be. But the fact was that the League's belated entry into the Government was only a negative, not a positive step. It had been taken "mainly to retrieve the

machinery of Government at best partially
 from the monopolistic control of the Congress," as a League spokesman declared. As
 much was realised by Mr. Jinnah at the very
 outset when he accepted the "inequitable
 distribution of portfolios" under protest.
 It was clearly understood then, that the
 struggle of Pakistan was "to be carried on
 within as well as outside the Government."
 How it could be possible with this dual
 policy either to achieve Pakistan or to bring
 about harmony in the Government and
 peace in the country—it was difficult to
 imagine! What with the open hostility
 between the two parties outside the Govern-
 ment and their fake friendship inside the
 Government, what with the aggressive
 nationalism of Congressmen who were now
 prone to rule singly rather than share
 power with others, and what with the deft
 hands of the Viceroy presiding over the
 deliberations of the "Cabinet" and holding
 the threads of its unity—the new National
 Government of India, though representing
 all parties, was a house of diverse cards that
 was built on sand. It would last only as

long as it served British interests, best served by an artificial and superficial unity among Indians. The moment a real unity began to grow up between the parties, it would be rent asunder and a Cabinet "crisis" precipitated in which it would be again up to the Viceroy to give his verdict in favour of one party as against the other. As long as the Congress British alliance continued, that verdict would doubtless be in favour of the Congress and the League would be forced to retrace its steps and start all over again.

Meanwhile, as a result of all this "open diplomacy", the struggle of Pakistan had fallen into a stalemate. The Muslim nation, which had started the march of freedom in high spirits, knew not which way to go and was again at a standstill. The Muslim League which had led the Muslim masses into the field of action had failed either to engage them in battle or to win a decisive victory for them without a fight. The League was now on the horns of a dilemma committed on the one hand to achieve the promised goal of Pakistan for Muslims, and on the other hand checkmated through its own weak,

negative and indecisive policy which had exposed all its cards on the table and had put the trumps in British hands. The contemplated Direct Action which was still hanging like the Sword of Democles in the air, had not yet been defined nor any sign was visible of its emerging into the realm of reality—with the consequence that both British and Congress had begun to treat it with mock-seriousness, while the Muslims began to lose that sense of confidence which is so vital in a nation's struggle for independence. The Muslim nation had been keyed to the last pitch of enthusiasm, standing as a huge mass of nerves and potential force, still inspired by the lofty ideals of Pakistan; but at this critical juncture it needed a clear-cut lead and a definite line of action, if its enthusiasm was to be sustained, if it had to become a really organised and formidable power and if the goal of Pakistan was to be attained or even kept within sight. Much energy of the nation was being sapped and much innocent Muslim blood was being shed, while the League hesitated between action and no-action, and conducted fruitless

negotiations in the futile hope of winning Pakistan. But the greatest tragedy was that in this period of "suspended animation" no effort was being made to organise the nation from within, that is, to prepare it for the emergency of an active struggle for achieving Pakistan. Instead, the Muslim League was again putting hope in British promises, and joining hands with the Congress rivals in the hope of defeating them on the chess-board of diplomacy. After having entered the Interim Government, the League had yet to enter the Constituent Assembly, and thus implement the second part of the great British plan. The Congress, which had entered the Government on its own terms and had interpreted the whole Cabinet Mission proposals to suit its own nefarious ends, now sought to convert the Constituent Assembly into a farce of freedom and to frame a constitution which would reject even the semblance of Pakistan which had been offered by the Cabinet Mission in the shape of Grouping. Grouping had now become a complex term thanks to the mass of clarification and counter-clarification heaped upon it. While the League

had interpreted it in terms of semi-sovereign federations within the Indian confederation, the Congress had twisted it to mean but a loose conglomeration of provinces, depending for its existence on the individual will of each province, and functioning under the direct suzerainty of a federal centre. Meanwhile, the British Ministers and the Viceroy who were the authors of this mischievous mixture of "sham-Pakistan-plus-sham-Independence" gloated in the intricacies of interpretation and offered to refer the matter to all sorts of Federal Courts and judicial tribunals. But the average Indian knew that there was neither unity nor independence in the proposed Union Centre, and the Muslims knew that there were hardly any "germs of Pakistan" in the barren plant of Grouping except the germs of perpetual discord and dissension not only between Hindus and Muslims but also between one province and another, and above all, between the Groups and the Centre. The Grouping of provinces, like the seats of the Interim Government, had proved another meatless bone of contention. What the Cabinet Mission had actually

conceded was only that the Muslim majority provinces in the North-West, Assam and Bengal in the East, should sit in Sections and form themselves into Groups *in the initial stage*, but that they would be free to opt out ultimately after the constitution had been drawn up. What a Grouping! Yet, the Congress raised such a hue and cry as if the heavens were falling on Hindustan, and the Muslim League ran after the mirage of Grouping as though it was Pakistan itself. Once more the British purpose was served. They gave the award at the London Conference that initial Grouping would stand, with a view (1) that the ingenious Cabinet Mission Plan might not fall through and might be accepted by both the parties in its entirety, and (2) that the Muslims might be finally diverted from the path of action and firmly secured in the tentacles of British-Congress hegemony.

But whether a short-term agreement based on a "working partnership" under British aegis was reached between League and Congress or not, the long-term settlement—so essential for the peace and freedom of the country—was

still far off, and would remain far off as long as this trio of tragedians continued to play with the freedom of India and Pakistan. The work of the Constituent Assembly was doomed to a dismal failure—even if the Muslim League joined it—unless any *independent* agreement was reached before hand on the intricate questions of Grouping, Communal Veto and functions of the Union Centre. For the Cabinet Mission had left these important issues purposely vague, and as long as the two parties did not come to a *mutual* agreement and a *permanent* readjustment of their demands, and did not cease to look towards the third party to arbitrate between their differences, they would continue to serve the British purpose of putting off the day of India's independence and of Pakistan. Pakistan would never be had by an artificial system of Grouping, nor by a vague and negative power of Communal Veto, nor for that matter by a semi-sovereign and semi-federal Central Government in which the Muslims would be in permanent minority. **Either there would be a free and sovereign state of Pakistan through a division of**

India into separate Muslim and Hindu zones—all composed into a central confederal authority on a *voluntary* basis, with sovereignty residing in the units and not in the Centre Or, as an alternative, a constitution would have to be drawn up in which every province would have full residuary powers and the common subjects would be under the direct control of a strong federal type of Centre, with sovereignty residing in the latter—but *with this important proviso that there would be permanent parity between Hindus and Muslims in the Federal, Executive and Legislature* In the first case it would be Pakistan on a territorial basis, in the second, a purely national Pakistan, in which the unity and freedom of the whole of India as well as the unity and freedom of all the Muslims of India would be assured For this, before any such constitution could be born, a bold and positive lead from the Congress and the League was needed—to throw away the schemes of British imperialists and to proceed with a joint direct action to win freedom

The British Government had failed, the

British people had failed, the Congress had failed, the Hindus had failed, even the Muslim League was failing. It was now up to the Muslim nation—the people—to uphold the freedom and honour of India and to raise the universal banner of Islam—the banner of truth, light and liberty. This was now the only surviving conception of Pakistan amid the general avalanche of destruction that had overtaken the land. The Muslims had been left in the lurch, not only by their enemies and their rivals, but also by their own brethren who held the keys of their kingdom. In this hour of all-round darkness when defeatism and despair were natural to follow, a new consciousness was dawning upon the nation—a consciousness which inspired the Muslims with a new faith and prepared them for a new action. *It was the Consciousness that they had sunk to the lowest depth of degradation and could only rise again by their own concentrated and concerted effort.* As a result of this mass consciousness the Muslims were already organising themselves. They were organising for a national emergency in which they

would have to undergo trials, hardships and sufferings, and for which they were building up a formidable power of material and moral resistance against oppression. This was the negative side of their preparation. On the positive side, they were slowly rising in revolt against the centuries-old forces of imperial domination and were getting ready to defy, resist or fight the agents of British Imperialism or its Indian henchmen. The fight might be violent or non violent—it did not matter much—but it would be an active struggle and so the Muslims had to organise themselves **ACTIVELY**. This they were doing by first casting off their rusted mantle of political bickering and bargaining and by embarking upon a revolutionary programme of national reconstruction—by building up the social, moral, economic and physical resources of the nation and thus reviving the old socialist spirit of Muslim nationalism. This was what the Muslim *Nation* was doing, regardless whether its leadership was doing it or not. And once this preparedness was complete, the way to struggle and final victory would be clear. Muslims now concentrated on the one goal

attainable not through the bounty of the British or of the Congress but through the right thought and right action of every true member of the Millat. Thus a new faith was born in the Muslims—a faith in themselves, in their ultimate destiny and in the infallible and eternal laws of the Quran. The Muslims were falling back on Islam. In this lay their last hope of salvation. They began to believe that the only way to win their Pakistan was making themselves worthy of it and not merely crying in a chorus of hundred million voices. Had it not been definitely promised:

انتم الاعلون ان كنتم مؤمنين

So the Muslims were chalking out their own destiny, by *believing* and by a *will for action*. They would now act for themselves and by themselves. They would strive to make themselves a nation, solid in foundation, righteous in conception and bold in action—and then no power on earth would be strong enough to cow them down.

By a wonderful coincidence of the laws of God, a similar metamorphosis was taking place in the Muslim countries all over the

world. A spirit of Islamic renaissance had gripped the isolationism of even such pseudo-nationalistic countries as Turkey, Egypt and Persia. And of course the Arabian Peninsula, after an interval of thirteen centuries, still stood as the lighthouse and the bulwark, diffusing light and hope to the millions of Muslims in the East and the West. The heroic struggle of the handful of Palestinian Arabs had given a new orientation to the idea of Pakistan. It had set the model and the standard for a Muslim war of independence—anywhere in the world. It had proved that Muslims can win only if they make themselves strong and straightforward, fearless and brave, too wilful to bow before any conqueror and generous enough to befriend the vilest enemy. Above all it had proved that Palestine, like Pakistan, was the common heritage of the world of Islam and was equally dear to every Muslim on the earth. The cause of the Arab or the Mussalman was now the cause of the entire Muslim world, and thus the boundaries of Pakistan—the Holy Land—stretched far beyond the boundaries of the Indus or the

Ganges. They were now the very boundaries of Pan-Islamism. Pakistan, having originated from the Pan-Islamic idea and having travelled far from its centre, was again realising itself in its true destiny. This revived idea of a universal Muslim nation was not an idea of narrow nationalism or selfish race interests based on a philosophy of fear and hatred—but it was a virile and positive urge for the brotherhood of man, for the unity of God and for the establishment of an ideal state of truth, peace and freedom in the modern world.

This was the only logical conclusion of the struggle of Pakistan. For, if it was true that the Muslims were a nation, it was also true that they were the same nation from Indonesia to Algiers. But if they wished to be restricted within the limitations of a country or a province, they had no right to demand a separate national existence or a homeland, especially in a country like India where they were widely scattered and closely intermixed with other nationalities. In fact the Muslims of India had to choose a happy *via media* whereby they would fall in line

with the general aspirations of the country in which they lived, thus discharging their geographical and historical obligations—and on the other hand would align themselves with the wider current of Muslim world renaissance so that, in this role as ambassadors of Islam in India they would create for them a place of honour and power in this country and an unlimited field of action abroad. The Indian Muslims, for the first time after the abortive Khilafat movement which had failed mainly due to the lack of Islamic Nationalism in the Muslim countries, were realising their true destiny now that the Muslim countries were themselves inspired with the Islamic ideal and were ready to join hands with their Indian brethren in launching a joint struggle for Muslim emancipation. The Muslims of India, who formed a great national bloc in India which again was the greatest single bloc in the Muslim world, had the grave and dual duty of leading the fight for freedom in India and of establishing Islam as a world force. *Pakistan was now nothing but the Muslim nation's—and ultimately of the Muslim world's—will to freedom, power and goodness*

CHAPTER V

Future of Pakistan

Muslims of India stand alone today, and the enemies of Islam stand victorious and smiling. The arch-enemy of Islam, the leader of Europe's barbaric civilisation, the greatest imperialist of the world—Britain—has today joined hands with a race of pigmy imperialists to defeat the forces of light and freedom and all that Islam stands for. For the cause of Islam in India is not only the cause of a hundred million Muslims who will live and die here as a nation, but more so the cause of truth, of the brotherhood of man and of the unity of God in this dark land—just as in the West it is the cause of peace and goodwill and faith against the nations of modern pagans. But even as in the West the Anglo-Americo-Jewish policy in Palestine has sought to give the final blow to rising Arabia, so have the British in alliance with

reactionary forces in India declared war on Pakistan—the nucleus of the new, brighter world of Islam.

But a new post-war turmoil has set in right earnest all over the world. The promised era of peace has turned out to be a new era of discontentment. The people everywhere are in revolt against the tyranny of power. The troubles in the Far East, the Middle East and the Balkans are isolated outbursts of the common impulse of man to be free—free from the fresh forces of exploitation and domination released from this war. In India where the struggle for freedom, started a hundred years ago, has reached its climax, another struggle has developed within the struggle. What was before an internal or a communal problem has now become an international clash. The war is now between three parties—the British, the Hindus and the Muslims—and upon each other.

All signs point to the conclusion that Britain has become an ally of the Hindu after setting "free" from her three centuries-old bondage. A new era of Indo-British alliance has begun to stem the world-wide resurrec-

tion of Islam. Muslim India which is rising as the leader of Islam and progress, is finding strange bed-fellows and new enemies. The Anglo-American lust for power, having ranged itself against the rival imperialism of Russia, is out to strengthen the citadels of reaction everywhere, and finds its interest in conflict with the Muslim world. A Pakistan in a free India would be a free state and a centre of progress in Asia, and will thus be a living threat to every imperialism. Against this potent danger, the British power seeks to find an alliance with the internal enemies of Pakistan who find with Britain their common enemies in socialism and true democracy. On the other hand, the internal enemies of Pakistan realise they are too weak to defend themselves either against an invader or against the Muslims and so they call Britain to instal them in power and perpetuate a joint rule over a United India.

Britain will give "independence" to India, but she will not quit India. British troops will remain here to guard India's North-West Frontier against the Red peril; the British navy will surround the Indian coast-

line; and British bayonets 'will protect majority nation against Muslim revolt. / thus British power, in alliance with Indian capitalists and politicians will continue to heavily on the heart of India—not only against the Muslims but against the millions of mute and hungry masses of this land. A greater and deadlier era of exploitation will be ushered in, in which a handful of powerful national exploiters will join hands with foreign imperialism to establish political tyranny and economic subjugation over the people in the names of democracy and nationalism. This will be independence with a vengeance indeed! Britain has a "Suez" in every land; and so she can afford to make a show of self-government and sit tight over her possessions—she can even quit the country, leaving it in "trusted" hands, with her own soldiers to look after them. Such independence serves the two-fold purpose of imperialism very well: (1) It keeps a strategic and friendly fortress to guard the far-flung outposts of the Empire against its enemies. (2) It maintains an economic and commercial stranglehold over the country through

native agents, as a price for helping them in power. As a British paper writes :

“ On the feature of the British troops in India, the Congress leaders are believed to have told Mr. Casey that provided an amicable settlement was reached there was no question of their being withdrawn for 10 years. They also made it clear that despite the Congress creed of non-violence, it has always been alive to the necessity of Defence and would have no objection to co-operation with Britain in warding off the Soviet influence—provided Britain in return recognised the Congress case ! ”

But the fact is that a new revolt is brewing under the general revolt of the Indian people. The Muslims for whom independence has no meaning except as a free and honourable existence have realised that a new tyranny is waiting for them—the tyranny of a joint Congress British rule. The same Congress which had for the last fifty years stood for the high ideals of justice and freedom has now, under the hands of its misguided leadership, stooped to the lowest tactics of intimidating a whole nation into

abject surrender. Rioting is no unusual phenomenon in India; but the 1946 riots have special significance as occurring at a time when the clash of national ideologies and the political tension of the parties had created a wide gulf in the feeling of the masses. So high is the fever running that a real partition of the country has already occurred beneath the false layer of unity still presented by the interested ones. Unless a constitutional settlement of the problem is agreed to this breach may widen and engulf the whole country. The prime responsibility for this catastrophe will fall on those who are fanning the fire today by their campaign of vilification and hatred. It is they who furnish material for the hooligan elements in the country to resort to violence. The story is too old now that communal riots in India are always inspired by officialdom or by the "third party"—the alien power and its local henchmen are too unpopular to-day to hold any influence over the masses, except through the unconscious instrumentality, of the Indian parties and their leaders.

It should be grim lesson for both League

and Congress. The League has to realise how futile it is to have a civil war at the present juncture when the third party is sitting as the presiding power. The League cannot, of course, compromise its basic demand for Muslim rights—nor it should. Nay, the League should be prepared to go to the last limit of sacrifice to deliver the Muslims out of this crisis. The League leaders should come out into the open, and ponder over the constructive side of the picture and should act according to a definite plan and policy. They must realise that if we have to fight to-day we must choose our enemies. Though we may have two enemies combined together against us, still we cannot hope to fight both at once. We must elect whom to fight first. Obviously, a Muslim-British combine against Hindus is inconceivable, if it would not be disgraceful—though the Hindus have preferred to join hands with the British. A civil war, too, will only perpetuate this unholy Indo-British alliance against Muslims. The only way out, then, is to have a revolution. For this we may join hands with the Congress (on honourable terms) if pos-

sible But even if the Congress does not come in, we may steal the march over the Congress by directing our movement towards the broader ideals of independence—ignoring the Congress authority and scrupulously avoiding the Hindu community—thereby attracting vast masses of India's millions to our struggle and winning their sympathy for the cause of Pakistan

The Congress on the other hand, must see the fire it is playing with It must realise the heavy responsibility of assuming office in face of stubborn Muslim opposition and in violation of their national rights, and it must be ready to face the consequences of any direct action by the Muslims if and when it comes Even if the Muslims plan a direct revolution against the British, an immediate clash will become inevitable with the Congress in power The Congress must realise that the Muslims will not be curbed by any Government, strong or weak, foreign or national—once the Muslims resort to the right type of organised activity It is high time for the Congress to act now in a manner worthy of a great organisation, even though that orga-

nisation now represents only the Hindus. If the Congress to-day plays the reactionary role of a party in political power and stands in the way of independence by creating chaos and anti-revolutionary forces in the land—the Congress will go down in history as the greatest traitor to India's freedom. But if the Congress has still some traces left of its old genuine love for freedom—and not merely for political power—then it must come out with a bold offer of co-operation to the Muslims. Though Muslims do not ask for charity where their inherent rights are concerned, yet a sincere and generous move from the Congress will help allaying the just fears of a minority nation. Let the Congress, therefore, offer coalition to the Muslim nation with a real desire to win freedom and work the coalition for the common goal.

What is the future of Pakistan? The Muslims are literally standing at the cross-roads. They have to choose between life and death—they have to decide not only their immediate political fate in this country but their national existence in India for a thousand years to come and, ultimately, their world-wide

destiny in relation to the immortal destiny of Islam. They have to decide whether they would *live* by sacrificing themselves for their faith, or will sacrifice faith itself at the altar of their rights and thus die an ignominious death. To-day, no amount of political bargaining, no ideologies and slogans and sporadic schemes of direct or indirect action can save them. What *can* save them, however, is a thorough re-orientation of their vision and a new inspiration for action based on a revival of their lost Faith. Pakistan is not a selfish political ideal or a bargaining counter is now only a dream, but Pakistan has a glorious future if it falls in line with the true spirit of Islam and becomes the leader of Muslim renaissance in the modern world. Faith is immortal, and Islam lives on despite the dark plots of its combined enemies. If faith still inspires the Muslims, no power on earth can subjugate them, and the deadliest instrument of destruction cannot stand in their way to freedom. Do they not see that while all the modernised and westernised armed countries went under the sway of imperialists, Afghanistan has stood like

stock amid the storm ? And while the whole of India was overrun and over-ruled by the foreign invader for centuries, he could not conquer the handful of tribesmen of the North-West Frontier who gave a shot for a shot ! It is the *spirit* that counts. If the time comes, the Muslims know how to wage a war of independence—not a mock war of nerves, but a long, intermittent, real war. They can forsake their homes and go into hiding and organise themselves into an unconquerable nation of soldiers. But before that we have to strive for peace, to organise ourselves and to make ourselves worthy of Pakistan.

First, we have to become Muslims again, and have to regain that selfless ardour which places the Faith above the Millat and the Millat above the individual. We must cease to think in terms of Muslims or Mussalmans, but in the higher terms of Islam, thus working for the restoration of a universal brotherhood based not merely on Pan-Islamism but on a true-Islamism. Then only can we claim to call ourselves a nation (scattered as we are throughout the globe and throughout this

country) not only in India where we are in a minority, not only in Arabia where we are in a majority, but from China to Peru.

Secondly, we have to build ourselves strong, individually and for the service of the Millat. Power and goodness in a Muslim go hand in hand, but goodness comes first and power which comes after is only for the sake of that goodness. In Islam, politics and religion are not two different things, but it is religion which is our politics and not politics, our religion. Pakistan would be an evil thing if it was only politics in garb of religion but it would be a blessing in disguise if it was religion in political garb. Political power, therefore, would be worth while achieving by Muslims only if they have to use it for goodness—and to ensure this, it is essential that they achieve goodness *first*. It is fallacious to argue that they are too weak and down-trodden to strive for goodness, but that goodness would come of itself once they achieve power. Nay, the Muslims cannot become strong without first becoming true Muslims, and even if they did the strength would be unworthy of them. Unfortunately,

Until now the national activities of the Muslims have been engrossed too much in politics to allow for any constructive work either for the social and economic uplift of the masses or for their religious reformation—with the result that at this critical hour of their history the Mussalmans are but a dishevelled mass of chaotic matter. They are united, but their unity is that of a flock of sheep rather than of a disciplined nation. They are ready for action, but their readiness, not preparedness, while their conception of action is too vague for any sustained effort or lasting sacrifice. And they are full of enthusiasm, but it is not yet the inspired enthusiasm for freedom, much less the lofty ardour of the soldiers of Faith. But the germs are no doubt there. The seed has been sown. If only the present unity, enthusiasm and will for action among Muslims be turned into the right channels, if only the inner and moral rejuvenation of the nation is wrought side by side with their political consciousness and national awakening, then the Muslims will be well on the road to eternal power.

And lastly—after we have secured our foundations in goodness and have armed ourselves with the most effective weapon of moral power, we must equip ourselves with material strength. Out of the present so-called Muslim nation, may be built up a reorganised socialist Millat, which in turn would be organised into a national militia, a nation of *living* soldiers in which every Muslim is trained to defend and fight for the Faith. Once a nation is turned into a well-knit army, even if it is unarmed with the modern weapons of warfare, and especially if it is inspired with the selfless love of truth, it can defeat any enemy however formidable and is sure to win any war in the long run. This then would be the real action for Muslims their highest action,—their direct action. It is not only possible in the modern world conditions but it is *the* action which alone can save them as well as the entire modern world from the deadly clutches of one-sided materialism and intermittent international warfare. If the Muslims have to progress—nay, even survive—they must march forward to take an active lead in|

world reorganisation, in the true spirit of a Mujahid, fearless and selfless, who goes out to fight to establish the law of truth, to forbid the wrong and enjoin the right and to spread God's message on earth. For this, we should march as one, irrespective of our personal alliances or enmities, with the sole object of restoring peace on earth and goodwill among mankind. When the Muslims fight they must fight on the side of right, and above all, they must fight for the sake of ultimate peace. In this way alone, Pakistan will be a boon for mankind and will save it from the catastrophe of an impending atomic war. What use or what promise of life can Pakistan have in the midst of the forces of imperialism and aggression, as long as Islam is considered to be a spent force and the Muslim world is in bondage? But if Islam is revitalised and the world of Islam marches as one—not as an international bloc but as the leader of a new world order—the Muslims can still be the torch-bearers of light and liberty. The Muslims have not merely to look for their own homes or the homes of their brethren in China and Arabia,

but also for the homes of their enemies in the East and the West. They have to save *them* by enlightening them with truth and arming them with faith. So that in this progress, the Muslims may attain to their promised land—their Pakistan !
